

The University of Chicago

FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

THE LITERARY WORK OF AMMIANUS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS
AND LITERATURE IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF
THE LATIN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

BY

MARY JACKSON KENNEDY

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY
LANCASTER, PA.
1912

PREFACE.

To Professor Hendrickson, at whose suggestion this thesis was undertaken, and with whose encouragement it was carried out, I wish to make all due acknowledgment.

MARY JACKSON KENNEDY.

THE LITERARY WORK OF AMMIANUS.

Standing, as he does, the last figure in Roman historical literature, Ammianus has a wide field from which to choose style and literary form. Apart from all external evidence, his work is proof of a heterogeneous education and omnivorous reading. Much has been written on the barbarities and extravagances of his diction but the plea contained in his own modestly proud expression, *ut miles quondam et Graecus*, is still the best apology for the liberties which he has taken with the Latin language, especially when we remember that to the eyes and ears of the corrupt age in which he lived simplicity was common and the unaffected vulgar. His theory of composition, although as interesting a matter as stylistic problems, has been little discussed. We cannot doubt that Ammianus had weighed this latter question carefully: the schools of rhetoric dominated the age, and none who had come under their influence could escape the necessity of limits imposed by tradition. A strict conception of the ideal in historiography had long existed. To its laws the majority of Latin authors, whose writings touched or lay within the sphere of history, had given recognition, either in word or practice. The great masters in this department of Roman literature, Livy, Sallust, Tacitus, had chosen for the most part to abide within the limits set by this theory. Between these writers and Ammianus had arisen biography, which, falling by its own legitimate tendency within the influence of encomiastic theory, had become at the hands of Nepos and Suetonius a recognized medium for the lasting memory of men and events, a medium of such power that influence from its methods on those traditional in history was inevitable. We find the authors of the *Historia Augusta* therefore openly transgressing the long-honored traditions of

historiography and reducing history to a mere chain of court trivialities and incidents. Still another factor that worked for change of theory in the realm of historical literature was the florid style and tasteless subject-matter of the panegyrists. It was amidst such a complex inheritance of influences that the Greek soldier of Asiatic origin set himself the bold task of taking up the threads of Roman history where they had fallen from the hands of Tacitus, and carrying them down to a period contemporaneous with his own activity. It has not escaped the notice of critics that Tacitus was his model in many respects, notably so in language. Points of contact or imitation in technique, however, have not been carefully traced or strongly emphasized, and yet it is in this respect perhaps that Tacitus has best served Ammianus as a guide. Similarities of language may be unconscious reminiscence or repetition; coincidences in theory, by their very nature, must be deliberate and for a settled purpose. We would not have the word theory in this connection misinterpreted. It would be going too far to insist upon or even claim a strict historical *method* of composition for Ammianus; to no such fixed principles does he appear to bind himself. He seems rather to have chosen from history, biography, panegyric, whatever suited his own taste, and was to his eyes best adapted to his purpose; points of technique once chosen, he shaped them to his own ends by means of devices learned in the school of rhetoric. The result is a system so elastic that it can hardly be called a consistent theory, and even from its light exactions the author often escapes, not wilfully but in apparent unconsciousness of its laws, however flexible. In spite of the incongruities and inconsistencies inevitably attendant on so lax an art, much can be found in the "Rerum Gestarum Libri" that is the outcome of a legitimate technique, which consciously or unconsciously was part of the debt of Ammianus to Tacitus. To offer tentative matter for the substantiation of the view just stated is the object of this paper. Data for the identification of method will be taken from parallel studies of the authors

compared, and these studies will be confined to points of technique in the delineation of character.

That Ammianus took up his work as a direct continuation of Tacitus is a commonplace of any history of Latin literature. This is the interpretation put upon his own words, XXXI. 16, 9: *Haec ut miles quondam et Graecus, a principatu Caesaris Nervae exorsus ad usque Valentis interitum pro virium explicavi mensura.*

His imitation of Tacitus in many points does not seem to be fully recognized, and the wide difference between Tacitus and Ammianus in the treatment of individual character has been one of the strongest hindrances to the recognition of this imitation. To formulate the difference mentioned in the broadest terms, the method used by Tacitus is the indirect, that of Ammianus, the direct; the former is artistic, the latter scientific.

We shall expect, therefore, to find the method of Ammianus governed by the rules laid down by Polybius, who denied to historians the dramatic privilege of presenting to the reader historical characters measured by the author's personal standard. According to these rules, a man's acts must be related by the historian without bias (Polyb., I. 14, 7 . . . 8. οὔτε τῶν φίλων κατηγορεῖν οὔτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἐπαινεῖν ὀκνητέον . . . ἀποστάντες οὖν τῶν πραττόντων αὐτοῖς τοῖς πραπομένοις ἐφαρμοστέον τὰς πρεπούσας ἀποφράσεις καὶ διαληψεις ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν); circumstances, influences, hereditary traits must be weighed in the balance, reconciled and related to circumstance and action voluntary or involuntary (Polyb., IX. 22, 9, 16. . . . Ἐνιοι μὲν γὰρ ἐλέγχεσθαι θάσι τὰς φύσεις ὑπὸ τῶν περιστάσεων καὶ τοὺς μὲν ταῖς ἐξουσίαις καταφανεῖς γιγνέσθαι, καὶ ὅλως τὸν πρὸ τοῦ χρόνου ἀναστέλλονται, τοὺς δὲ πάλιν ἐν ταῖς ἀτυχαίαις). Then only will the picture be a true one. More, the author's investigation must be free and open; he must give not merely the finished product of his brush, we must see each progressive touch in the work (Polyb., X. 26, 9. . . . καὶ περ ἡμεῖς . . . ἐπ' αὐπιῶν τῶν πραγμάτων ἀεὶ τὸν καθήκοντα λόγον ἀρμόζοντες ἀποφαινόμεθα περὶ

τε τῶν βασιλέων καὶ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν ἀνδρῶν, νομίζοντες ταύτην οἱ κειοτέραν εἶναι καὶ τοῖς γράφουσι καὶ τοῖς ἀναγιγνώσκουσι τὴν ἐπισημασίαν).

The author who employs this direct or scientific method is limited to the purely subjective, and barred by the very spirit of his work from the indirect technique. The indirect method, on the other hand, while adopting as a convenience objective media, need set no such definite limits to its scope. Art is freer than science. The author, with his finger on the pulse of the world, includes the needs of the reader as well as the hearts of his characters in his world-knowledge, and his art is plastic for both. Where the narrative, the recorded judgment of friends or enemies, individuals or state, public gossip, the manifest results of actions fail to paint the portrait in the tones desired, it is the author's privilege to step forth from the background, and give expression to his own estimate; where dramatic insinuation might go too far, he may check it in like manner.¹

Of the latter art of delineation Tacitus is past master, rarely resorting to direct methods. Objective as we must term his technique, in no author do we feel more subjective force, and in spite of the close reserve and repression of personality that characterizes his art, we are always conscious that it is the author's own deep convictions and strong judgments to which his spell causes us to incline.² Ammianus adopted for his work the historiographical form of Tacitus, the annalistic, but the influence of a long period of biography dominated by rhetoric, together with the natural preferences of a character like that of Ammianus, brought about a method of characterization in the main distinctly antithetical to that of his great prototype.

¹ It is here assumed that the reference in Polybius, although referring strictly to the presentation of historical facts, may be extended to include points of characterization for individuals.

Cf. Bruns, "Persönlichkeit und Geschichtsschreibung d. Gruchen," p. 44, Jene über das Wesen eines Mannes kurz orientirenden Worte sind eben da am Platze, wo die indirekte Charakteristik sich nicht entfalten kann. Cf. also p. 46 ff.

² For all established principles for the indirect method, the chapter on Thucydides in Bruns's "Literarische Porträt der Gruchen," pp. 1-45, must be considered the original source.

That the sources used by Ammianus were a potent factor for the subjective tone of his portraiture of character is certain; the elogia, which he employs to set the mark of impressiveness on a prominent character at the close of a career, are proof positive of what he owed to biography and panegyric. Perhaps it is the influence of Livy and Tacitus that causes us to feel that a chronicle should be outwardly at least without individuality, and that the tone of encomiastic biography is not in keeping with the form of historiography. At any rate the student of Ammianus cannot but feel inconsistencies between the annalistic form of the narrative whose pages he is turning, and the author's frank revelation of himself and his estimates of the characters that he depicts.³ Ammianus, however, departs on occasion from the precepts of Polybius, and where this occurs, it may be traced as a rule to a Tacitean reminiscence. His delineation in the main, however, is free and open; there are few insinuations, no veiled judgments; he expresses his thoughts and estimates with the artlessness of a child. We get a plain view of his intended work in each case, and proceed with him step by step as he investigates and weighs actions. Tacitus, on the other hand, gives us only the finished pictures; the causes that led to the conception of that picture remain unknown or are matter of conjecture.⁴ There is no need to ask in the case of Ammianus, as in that of Tacitus, how far his design in character delineation went, or whether these characters are being used also as dramatic illustrations of times and situations. We recognize the fact that he is giving us his own conception of each personage, and his only object in so doing is to describe that personage.

A comparison of parts of the work of each author, dealing with historical situations not dissimilar, will best illustrate the essential differences above sketched.

³ See Bruns's remarks on this, "Die Persönlichkeit in d. Geschichtsschreibung d. Alten," p. 63 ff.

⁴ Cf. Bruns, "Die Persönlichkeit in der Geschichtsschreibung der Alten," p. 78 ff. "Es ist ebenso das Princip des Tacitus, wie es das des Thukydides war, den Leser in seine psychologischen Voruntersuchungen keinen Einblick thun zu lassen."

The Annals of Tacitus, I and the early part of II, are devoted partly to the campaigns of Germanicus in Germany. The figure of Germanicus stands out vividly as we read, but no less clearly do we see the personality of Tiberius in the background, and we feel assured that this is what the author intended. The narrative is essentially historical; rarely does it cross the limits of historiography; and yet the skill of Tacitus leaves two brilliant portraits, the successful Caesar, battling abroad for the Empire, the jealous Emperor in the court at home.

It is not pressing an analogy too far to set side by side with these passages of Tacitus that part of the work of Ammianus which contains the narrative of the early history of Julian and Constantius, Books XV–XXI, where the historical setting is very similar, and the relations of the two main personages present a sufficiently close parallel. The portraits drawn by Ammianus are as conspicuous as those of Tacitus, and form companion pictures for them. No one can read this portion of the later historian's work without being fully convinced, in spite of the sharp contrast which the methods of delineation adopted by Ammianus often offer to those of Tacitus, that here at least the earlier author was the later author's model.

Before entering upon a closer examination of these passages, it will not be out of place to consider a general matter, that of fullness of detail. The narrative covering the campaigns of Germanicus belongs to the years 14, 15 and 16 A. D., and is comprised in about thirty pages of Teubner text; the account of Julian in Ammianus covers the period from 355–361 A. D. (*i. e.*, up to Julian's acclamation as Emperor) and is included in about fifty pages of the same reckoning. The difference in detail is remarkable. The narrative of Tacitus is particularly full, names of officers, and even of inferiors, incidents of battle, the tribes of the enemy, their leaders, and many less prominent personages being enumerated. In Ammianus, considering the closer relation of the author to the era with which he deals, we have much less detail of that kind, save where, mindful of the dramatic effect attained by Tacitus, he is adopting, almost

mechanically, the treatment of his model; the officers come in for little attention, except those that serve as foils to Julian. The omission of such particulars leaves room, of course, for the more extended characterization of the leading figure necessary in the technique of Ammianus, but it is not so much this omission as the entirely different purpose for which the details given are apparently utilized that engages our attention. In Tacitus they seem part of the narrative; in Ammianus there is much open use of them to characterize the leading figures. We do not lose sight of Germanicus in the pages of Tacitus any more than we do of Julian in Ammianus, but in the former case we must do our own characterization from narrated events and facts; Ammianus freely interprets for us, and assists our judgment. Yet, when we reach the end, the studied reserve of the Tacitean method has marked Germanicus as his darling and Tiberius as the object of his detestation, as vividly as the later author's frankly encomiastic or critical treatment had shown his opinions of Julian and Constantius.

That Ammianus intends to glorify that part of his work which relates to Julian is frankly stated in the introductory sentence of his excursus on the Gauls, XV. 9, 1.

Proinde quoniam—ut Mantuanus vates praedixit excelsus—maius opus moveo, maiorque mihi rerum nascitur ordo. . . . But he strikes the keynote of his treatment of Julian still more clearly for us in XVI. 1, 2-3.

Quia igitur res magnae quas per Gallias virtute felicitateque correxit, multis veterum factis fortibus praestant, singula serie progrediente monstrabo, instrumenta omnia mediocris ingenii, si suffecerint, commoturus. Quicquid autem narrabitur, quod non falsitas arguta concinnat, sed fides integra rerum absoluit documentis evidentibus fulta, ad laudativampaene materiam, pertinebit.

The general tone of apology reminds the reader of the commonplaces with which the author of an encomiastic oration excuses his panegyric, and which the rhetoricians enjoined for works of laudatory character, to anticipate any prejudicial feelings that praise might engender. In Aristides (Sp. II. 506, 13) we have among the *τρόποι τοῦ μὴ φορτικῶς ἐπαινεῖν*, one

that covers this point: *τρίτος τρόπος ὅταν πρὶν εἰπεῖν π συγνώμην ἐφ' οἷς ἄν μέλλη λέγεσθαι*. Another feature of the encomium is found in the words "instrumenta omnia mediocris ingenii, si *suffecerint*, commoturus." Doxopater lays down as one of the laws of encomium such a profession of incapacity in comparison with the subject (Doxopater, Walz. Rh. Gr., II. 449, 33. . . . *νόμος ἐστὶ τοῖς ἐγκωμιάζουσι μείζονα τοῦ οἰκείου λόγου τὴν προσκεμένην ὑπόθεσιν*).

But it is in the last phrase of 2 that Ammianus most clearly defines his method—*ad paene laudativam materiam pertinebit*. Here we have complete acknowledgment of his intention, and we shall see that this purpose is maintained, often even in technicalities, throughout his treatment of Julian, partly through his own observance of rhetorical theory, partly by reflection of the biographical and encomiastic sources, on which, no less than on personal recollection, he based his representation of his favorite Emperor.

The passage given above, although preparing us for the narrative of Julian's exploits, is not his first introduction into the pages of Ammianus. In XV. 8, 5-18, we have a description of his adoption as Caesar by Constantius, and the first characterization of him is found in the same passage. This is one of the places where Ammianus, fresh from preparatory perusals of his great model, resorts to the indirect technique and uses it most skilfully. The scene is highly dramatic, affording an excellent opportunity for objective characterization.

XV. 8, 4: Cum venisset accitus praedicto die, advocato omni quod aderat commilitio, tribunali ad altiorem suggestum erecto, quod aquilae circumdederunt et signa, Augustus inscendens eumque (Julian) manu retinens dextra, haec sermone placido peroravit.

Obvious instruments for characterization are the speech of Constantius, and the description of the reception of the new Caesar by the soldiers, both of which Ammianus uses. After an introductory reference to the disturbance in Gaul, the Emperor presents their future commander to the army in the following words (XV. 8, 8):

Julianum hunc fratrem meum patruelem, ut nostis, verecundia, qua nobis ita ut necessitudine carus est, recte spectatum iamque elucetis industriae iuvenem in Caesaris adhibere potestatem exopto, coeptis, si videntur utilia, etiam vestra consensione firmandis.

The last clause is the cue for interruption by the soldiers, given in the following paragraph (XV. 8, 9):

Dicere super his plura conantem interpellans contio lenius prohibebat, arbitrium summi numinis id esse, non mentis humanae, velut praescia venturi praedicans.

This is acknowledged and interpreted by the Emperor with further characterizing phrases (XV. 8, 10):

Quia igitur vestrum quoque favorem adesse fremitus indicat laetus, adulescens vigoris tranquilli, cuius temperati mores imitandi sunt potius quam praedicandi ad honorem prosperatum exurgat: cuius praeclaram indolem bonis artibus institutam hoc ipso plene videor exposuisse quod elegi.

After the formal assumption of the insignia of Caesar, during which the soldiers show further approval (*cum exercitus gaudio*), Constantius concludes his speech with a conventional exhortation to the future commander. A flattering burst of applause from the contio completes this bit of historical drama (XV. 8, 15):

Nemo post haec finita reticuit sed militares omnes horrendo fragore scuta genibus inidentes—quod est prosperitatis indicium plenum, . . . —immane quo quantoque gaudio praeter paucos Augusti probavere iudicium Caesaremque admiratione digna suscipiebant imperatoris muricis fulgore flagrantem.

It is readily seen that the speech of Constantius, although serving the usual purposes of a speech in historiography, that of adding to the dramatic effect and placing the situation in summary, is here utilized also for laudatory ends. The praise bestowed on Julian follows the rhetorical formulae for encomium. We have his mores (*verecundia*, XV. 8, 8; *temperati mores*; *praeclaram indolem*, 10), his bodily powers (*vigoris*

tranquilli, 10), his *παίδευσις* (bonis artibus institutam, 10); and the phrase "imitandi sunt potius quam praedicandi" might have been culled from a panegyric. An admirable instance of the indirect technique is found in the words *contractiore vultu submaestum* used to characterize Julian during the ceremony. In Tacitean fashion the reader is left to interpret this for himself; but the conclusion is obvious. These words contain a tribute to the *ψυχή* of Julian, which disdained the honors of a throne in comparison with higher things, and are directly in keeping with the glimpses of his character revealed by the Emperor's speech.⁵

A more open touch of personal praise is added in XV. 8, 16, where the soldiers scrutinize more closely their new commander:

cuius oculos cum venustate terribiles vultumque excitantius gratum diu multumque contuentes, qui futurus sit, colligebant, velut scrutatis veteribus libris, quorum lectio per corporum signa pandit animorum interna.

Julian's progress through Vienna (XV. 8, 21-22) gives further opportunity for indirect praise, in the description of the flattering reception given him by the populace. The praise is of the most exaggerated kind (*salutarem quendam genium adfulsisse*) and there are traces of the rhetorical *αὔξησις*,⁶ so common in encomium. The omen for future greatness, which appeared generally in the *γένεσις*⁷ of the encomium, is introduced in 22, presaging preeminence for Julian at the entrance into his new life.

XV. 8, 21: Cumque Viennam venisset, ingredientem optatum quidem et impetrabilem honorifice susceptura omnis aetas con-

⁵ We feel a continuance of this in XV. 8, 17, where the newly chosen Caesar is borne to the palace muttering a line from Homer: *susceptus denique ad consessum vehiculi, receptusque in regiam, hunc versum ex Homérico carmine susurrabat*, ἔλλαβε πορφύρεος θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταίη. This is a note in the biographical manner, an echo of Suetonius.

⁶ Aristides, Sp. II. 505, 10. λαμβάνονται δὲ οἱ ἔπαινοι κατὰ τρόπους τεσσαρας αὔξησει παραλείψει, παραβολῇ, εὐφημία.

⁷ Hermog., Sp. II. 12, 8. ἔρεται δὲ τίνα καὶ ἃ περὶ τὴν γένεσιν συνέπεσεν ἀξία θαύματος ὅλον ἐξ ὀνειράτων ἢ συμβόλων ἢ τινων τοιούτων. Cf. Nich. Soph., Sp. III. 480, 31 ff.; Menand., Sp. III. 371, 3 ff.; Quint., III. 7, 11.

currebat, et dignitas proculque visum plebs universa cum vicinitate finitima, imperatorem clementem appellans et faustum, praevia consonis laudibus celebrabat, avidius pompam regiam in principe legitimo cernens; communiumque remedium aerumnarum in eius locabat adventu, salutarem quendam genium adfulsisse conclamatis negotiis arbitrata.

22. Tunc anus quaedam orba luminibus cum percontando quinam esset ingressus, Iulianum Caesarem comperisset, exclamavit, hunc deorum templa reparaturum.

In the following book (XVI), Ammianus lays aside all attempt at continuing the indirect technique, and employs the most openly encomiastic style, as formulated by rhetoricians, preparing the reader for such a step by the words "ad laudativam paene materiam pertinebit," already quoted. This passage comprises XVI. 1; 4, 5, and its quotation will best serve to illustrate the point of open laudation (XVI. 1; 4, 5):

4. Videtur enim lex quaedam vitae melioris hunc iuvenem a nobilibus cunis ad usque spiritum comitata supremum. Namque incrementis velocibus ita domi forisque conluxit ut prudentia Titus alter aestimaretur, bellorum gloriosis cursibus Traiani simillimus, clemens ut Antoninus, rectae perfectaeque rationis indagine congruens Marco, ad cuius aemulationem actus suos effingebat et mores.

5. Et quoniam, ut Tulliana docet auctoritas, omnium magnarum artium sicut arborum altitudo nos delectat, radices stirpesque non item, sic praeclaræ huius indolis rudimenta tunc multis obnubilantibus tegebantur, quæ anteferri gestis eius postea multis et miris hac ratione deberent, quod adulescens primævus ut Erechtheus in secessu Minervæ nutritus ex academiae quietis umbraculis non e militari tabernaculo in pulverem Martium tractus, strata Germania, pacatisque rigentis Rheni meatibus, cruenta spirantium regum hic sanguinem fudit, alibi manus catenis adflixit.

Although the whole passage is in a high strain of praise, the most strongly rhetorical touch is in the accumulation of comparisons in 4 with Titus, Trajan, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. This *σύγκρισις*, which is here of a formal character, was a marked feature of the encomium.⁸

⁸ Hermog., Sp. II. 13, 3. *μεγίστη δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἐγκωμίοις ἀφορμὴ ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν συγκρίσεων, ἣν τάξεις ὡς ἀν ὁ καιρὸς ὑφηγῆται.*

This is a detailed example of the *σύγκρισις μερική*, likening the compared characters in one single point.⁹

Another example of this figure may be noted in 5, in the words "non e militari tabernaculo in pulverem Martium tractus." Here the comparison is implied, and the reader feels the "ut alii," to be supplied after non. The negative adverb marks another rhetorical device, *ἀναίρεσις*, frequently employed in a syncritical passage, and mentioned by Hermog. (Sp. II. 307)¹⁰ as an instrument of the grand (*σεμνός*) style. The words in 5, multis obnubilantibus tegebantur, may be interpreted in close relation to the last figure named, serving to paint a background of obstacles which will enhance Julian's later glory; we might also consider them as a light *λύσις* of possible criticism of the Caesar's early inert life. Such explanations were allowed by rhetoricians to encomiasts.¹¹ The highly rhetorical exaggeration of the closing words of this passage also forms part of the encomiastic treatment (*strata Germania, pacatisque rigentis Rheni meatibus cruenta spirantium regum hic sanguinem fudit, alibi manus catenis adflixit*).

XVI. 2, 2 continues in the same tone; the background of difficult circumstances is deepened by the words, "ancillari adulatione posthabita, qua eum proximi ad amoenitatem flectebant et luxum," picturing the allurements to luxury to heighten the virtue of temperance that resists them, and the phrase "velut dux diuturnus" is conspicuous praise for a young and inexperienced leader. In 4, 5, 6, our attention is called to his bravery and ardor (fidentius Caesar audaciam viri fortis imitari magnopere nitebatur). His strategic skill is proved in 7, and the result is pointed out (proinde certiore spe . . . venit Tricasas adeo insperatus ut eo portas paene pulsante diffusae multitudinis barbarae metu aditus urbis

⁹ Menand., Sp. III. 377, 5. ἀλλ' ἐκεῖναι (σύγκρισεις) μὲν ἔσονται μερικάι, ὅσον παιδείας παιδεῖαν ἢ σωφροσύνης πρὸς σωφροσύνην.

¹⁰ λέξεις δὲ λαμπραὶ αἰπερ ἐλέγοντο εἶναι καὶ σεμναί. Cf. Nich. Soph., Sp. III. 487, 32 ff., ὅν σύγκρισις: φράσιν δὲ ὁμοίως ἑαυτὰυθὰ πομπικὴν καὶ θεατρικὴν εἶναι τοῦ σεμνοῦ.

¹¹ Nich. Soph., Sp. III. 482, 11 ff. τὰς λύσεις ἐπάξιοιμα ἰσχυροτέρας ἵνα πανταχόθεν τὸ τῆς ἀντιθέσεως βλάβος λύηται.

non sine anxia panderetur ambage). The next personal note is in 11: "hinc deinde nec itinera nec flumina transire posse sine insidiis putans erat pròvidus et cunctator, quod praecipium bonum in magnis ductoribus opem ferre solet exercitibus et salutem," the side remark giving the interpretation of the action.

XVI. 3, 3, after some annalistic details in 1, 2, resumes the characterization, illustrating the efficiency of the young general, with a world of wars upon his shoulders, "ubi bellorum inundantium molem humeris suis quod dicitur vehens scindebatur in multiplices curas, ut milites qui a solitis descivere praesidiis reducerentur ad loca suspecta, et conspiratas gentes in noxam Romani nominis disiectaret ac provideret, ne alimenta deessent exercitui per varia discursuro." The generalities employed here are such as encomiastic biography could supply. XVI. 4, 4 prepares the way for further eulogistic writing: "*efficacissimus* Caesar providebat constanti sollicitudine ut militum diuturno labori quies succederet aliqua licet brevis. . . . 5. verum hoc quoque diligentia curato pervigili, adfusa laetiore spe prosperorum, sublato animo ad exsequenda plurima consurgebat."

The ensuing description of Julian in camp and civil life is a real bit of encomiastic biography, resting upon an account of the Caesar's moderation and his care for the soldiers. *Σωφροσύνη*, it will be remembered, was one of the four cardinal virtues, under which the encomiastic writer classed the *πράξεις* of his subject. Julian maintained this temperance, as Ammianus makes us clearly understand, in spite of manifold inducements to the contrary.

XVI. 5, 1. *temperantiam ipse sibi indixit atque retinuit.*

XVI. 5, 3. Denique cum legeret libellum assidue, quem Constantius ut privignum ad studia mittens, manu sua conscripserat, praelicenter disponens, quid in convivio Caesaris impendi deberet: phasianum, et vulvam et sumen exigi vetuit et inferri, munificis militis vili et fortuito cibo contentus.

The deeds that are enumerated under this head (3) show an

underlying moral purpose (*προαίρεσις*), again a rhetorical point.¹² After this come his pursuits and studies, divided under the heads of night and day (XVI. 5, 4-8; 9). The former correspond to the *ἐπιτηδεύματα* of the rhetorician, in its highest sense, as given by Menand., Sp. III. 372, 3, *ἐπιτηδεύματα δ' ἐστὶν ἄνευ ἀγώνων πράξεις ἡθικάι*. These especially indicate character, as they imply choice. Under this head we hear of Julian's diligent application to study and statesmanship.

XVI. 5, 4. Hoc contingebat ut noctes ad officia divideret tripartita, quietis et publicae rei et musarum.

In this we meet again a *σύγκρισις* with Alexander the Great, strongly balanced in favor of Julian.

4, 5. quid factitasse Alexandrum legimus Magnum; sed multo hic fortius. Ille namque aenea concha supposita brachio extra cubile protento pilam tenebat argenteam, ut cum nervorum vigorem sopor laxasset, infusus, gestaminis lapsi tinnitus abrumperet somnum. (5) Iulianum vero absque instrumento quotiens voluit, evigilavit et nocte dimidiata semper exsurgens, non e plumis vel stragulis sericis ambiguo fulgore nitentibus sed ex tapete et *σιούρα*.

Conspicuous here too is the *ἀναίρεσις* (*non e plumis*, etc.) in combination with the figure of comparison. We learn in the following paragraphs (5, 6, 7, 8) of Julian's devotion to poetry, philosophy, theology, oratory and history; of his acquaintance with Greek and Latin. The closing sentence in 8 openly avows the intention to characterize in enumerating his pursuits; "et haec quidem pudicitiae virtutumque sunt signa nocturna."

Julian's justice and ability in civil life are characterized in 10-15, to which 9 forms a rhetorical transition, filled with epithets of encomiastic nature.

XVI. 5, 9. Diebus vero quae *ornate* dixerit et *facete*, quaeve in apparatu vel in ipsis congressibus proeliorum, aut in re civili *mag-nanimmitate* correxit et *liberalitate*, suo quaeque loco demonstra-buntur.

¹² Arist. Rhet., I. 9, 32. *ἐπεὶ δ' ἐκ τῶν πράξεων ὁ ἔπαινος . . . πειρατέον δεικνύναι πρᾶττοντα κατὰ προαίρεσιν . . . τὰ δ' ἔργα σημεῖα τῆς ἕξεως ἐστίν.*

We may distinguish in this the grouping of the *πράξεις* under the divisions of war (in *ipsis congressibus proeliorum*) and peace (in *re civili*), which corresponds to the manner of encomium,¹³ and was adopted into biography. A purely biographical feature is here introduced, that of the *ἀποφθέγματα*.

10. When confronted with the difficulties of initiation into military drill, he utters "vetus illud proverbium clitellae bovi sunt impositae; plane non est nostrum onus."

11. et imperator "rapere" inquit, "non accipere sciunt agentes in rebus."

12. "'incusent' iura clementiam, sed imperatorem mitissimi animi legibus praestare severis decet."

Such is the characterization of Julian in some ten pages of Ammianus, after the first appearance of his hero Emperor upon the scene as Caesar.

We shall now turn to the portion of the Annals where Germanicus is portrayed under not unlike conditions. We shall find very little of the presence of the author's personality that marks the writing of Ammianus. The author's comments are so rare that their presence is always a surprise. We get our first glimpse of Germanicus in the historian's most objective fashion, through the medium of the thoughts of Tiberius, one of whose chief causes for apprehension at the death of Augustus was (*Ann.*, I. 7) "ne Germanicus, in cuius manu tot legiones, immensa sociorum auxilia, mirus apud populum favor, habere imperium quam exspectare mallet." There is no characterization of Germanicus here—simply a background of "mirus apud populum favor" to make us desirous to know more of this people's darling. In chapter 31, we learn also that the hopes of the German legions turned toward Germanicus, "magna spe fore ut Germanicus Caesar imperium alterius pati nequiret, daret se legionibus vi sua cuncta tracturis," a touch that, like the first reference, stimulates interest in Germanicus. In chapter 33 we have at the actual introduction of Germanicus

¹³ τὰς τοιαύτας τοῦν διαίρησεις πράξεις δίχα εἰς τε τὰ κατ' εἰρήνην καὶ τὰ κατὰ πόλεμον. Menand., *Sp.* II. 372, 25 ff.

a short γένος (ipse Druso fratre Tiberii genitus, Augustae nepos, sed anxius occultis in se patruī aviaēque odiis, quorum causae aciores, quia iniquae . . . credebaturque si rerum potitus foret libertatem redditurus; unde in Germanicum favor et spes eadem). His marriage to Agrippina is mentioned in the preceding sentence. There is nothing so far beyond the briefest relation of facts necessary for historiography, including the popular belief upon which rested the "favor et spes." In the next sentence we come upon a really subjective touch: "nam iuveni civile ingenium, mira comitas, et diversa ab Tiberii sermone, vultu, adrogantibus et obscuris." A personal comment seems almost necessary here, and even the most reserved of historians could not avoid it, especially when it could carry with it a fling at Tiberius.

The opening words of chapter 34 convey an impression of Germanicus in a generous light; "sed Germanicus quanto summae spei propior, tanto impensius pro Tiberio niti," but the historian does not comment even with an adjective. In the dramatic events that follow, Germanicus, although present to our minds throughout, does not claim the main share of attention; when we recall the scene to our imagination, it is a mutinous camp that we see, and this is indisputably what the historian intended, and what the technique of historiography demanded. This scene, however, can be best compared with a portion of Ammianus upon which we have not yet touched. It will be dwelt upon in detail hereafter. All that is insisted upon here is, that where Tacitus had an opportunity openly to make Germanicus conspicuous, he refrained from so doing and subserved the purposes of history. A general comparison might be instituted between this scene in the Annals and the coronation scene in Ammianus: in the one all present are actors in the scene; in the other all are mere supernumeraries, with the exception of the central figure, the Caesar in his imperial robes. Chapter 36, which might have given scope for enlarging upon the general's wise policy, opens with a purely impersonal line, "consultatum ibi de remedio," and we have no mention

of any conspicuous part played by Germanicus in the matter. In the ensuing chapters, the narrative is absolutely colorless, not a single epithet of any kind being applied to Germanicus, nor is the slightest suggestion of interpretation of his actions to be discovered, even his speeches being devoid of all characterizing qualities.

When we reach chapter 51, we come upon a touch which, interpreted by the rules of rhetoric, is encomiastic:

excivit ea caedes Bruderos, Tubantes, Usipites, saltusque, per quos exercitui regressus, insedere. Quod gnarum duci incessitque itineri et proelio.

This may be taken as a result of the leader's remarkable sagacity, and in the encomium would be classed under the virtue *φρόνησις*. Later in the chapter comes another sentence also capable of such interpretation,

turbabanturque densis Germanorum catervis leves cohortes, cum Caesar advectus ad vicensimanos voce magna hoc illud tempus obliterandae seditionis clamitabat.

In the succeeding chapter, 52, the phrase "bellicaque Germanici gloria" may be construed into a recognition by the author of the Caesar's exploits. A very slight tone of comment may also be inferred in 58, "clementi responso." Chapters 61 and 62 are doubtless intended to present forcefully the pious and patriotic attitude of Germanicus in rendering the last rites to Varus and his army, but the author places the narrative before us without a comment; it is left to us to read into the lines a tribute to the "pietas" of Germanicus, unless the adjective "gratissimo" in 62, characterizing the action of the general as he places the first sod, is a personal note. But the attitude of the whole army (61), "permoto ad miserationem omni qui aderat exercitu ob propinquos, amicos denique ob casus bellorum et sortem hominum," and the mention of Germanicus in 62 as "socius" makes him merely an actor in the scene, and important only through his position as general.

The next passage from which we deduce any characterization of Germanicus is I. 71, where, after the great loss in battle, the

conduct of the leader is narrated, evidently to impress his humanity and thoughtful care (*φιλανθρωπία*).

Germanicus . . . propria pecunia militem iuvit. Utque cladis memoriam etiam comitate leniret, circumire saucios, facta singulorum extollere; vulnera intuens, alium spe, alium gloria, cunctos adloquio et cura sibi et proelio firmabat.

It is in Book II, chapters 12, 13, that Tacitus gives us the most interesting and impressive part of his delineation of Germanicus. A most advantageous point for the characterization of a general is immediately before or after a battle. Tacitus has already availed himself of the latter opportunity in I. 5; here in Book II we find the former. This is perhaps as striking an example as can be presented of the Tacitean resources for characterization without laying aside the author's mask. Rumors and references to the Roman people's love for Germanicus have marked him for the reader with the stamp of popularity; but Germanicus is at this moment far from the Roman people, and characterization, unless subjective, must come through the army. Never did dramatist resort to a more unique device than Tacitus has employed on this occasion.¹⁴ We see Germanicus, in his anxiety to learn the feelings of his men with regard to the coming conflict, steal forth under cover of darkness and in fantastic disguise (*per occulta et vigilibus ignara, comite uno, contectus umeros ferima pelle*), to try the disposition of the unwitting soldiers as shown in free converse with one another (II. 12, *penitus noscendae mentes cum secreti et incustoditi inter militaris cibos spem aut metum proferrent*).¹⁵ Incidentally he enjoys the privilege not usual

¹⁴ The force of this passage for characterization has been most fully recognized by those interested in points of technique. Cf. Bruns, "Die Persönlichkeit in der Geschichtsschreibung der Alten," p. 72; Hendrickson, "Proconsulate of Julius Agricola," p. 21.

¹⁵ Ammianus (XIV. 1, 9) represents Gallus (and by implication Gallienus) resorting to a similar but more direct expedient to learn the estimation in which he was held: *novo denique perniciosoque exemplo idem Gallus ausus est inire flagitium grave, quod Romae cum multo dedecore temptasse aliquando dicitur Gallienus, et adhibitis paucis clam ferro succinctis vesperi per tabernas palabantur et compita, quaeritando Graeco sermone cuius erat impeditio gnarus, quid de Caesare quis que sentiret*. Both motive and result, we may conclude, were different from those of the quest of Germanicus.

for eavesdroppers (fruiturque fama sui, cum hic nobilitatem ducis, decorem alius, plurimi patientiam, comitatem, per seria per iocos eundem animum laudibus ferrent, reddendamque gratiam in acie faterentur). The most open praise could not more plainly convey to us the author's judgment of Germanicus than these few lines, couched in purely objective form.

The ensuing chapter contains the general's speech before the battle, given with suggestions of praise (II. 14: vocat contionem et quae sapientia provisa aptaque imminenti pugnae disserit. Cf. I. 15, orationem ducis secutus militum ardor).

In II. 20, we find a rhetorically encomiastic touch such as has been noticed in I. 51 (quod gnarum duci). Here the expression has a wider scope (II. 20: Nihil ex his Caesari incognitum; consilia locos prompta occulta noverat astusque hostium in perniciem ipsis vertebat), and the intent to glorify Germanicus as a leader is more strongly felt by the reader. Still the author does not betray himself by any epithet or phrase such as Ammianus uses under like circumstances (XVI. 2, 11: erat providus et cunctator quod *praecipium bonum in magnis ductoribus opem ferre solet exercitibus et salutem*). In the same chapter, "primus Caesar cum praetoriis cohortibus capto vallo dedit impetum in silvas" may emphasize for the reader the *ἀνδρεία* of Germanicus, and we are arrested in the next chapter (21) by the same strain; after openly acknowledging the bravery (virtus) of the leaders of the Germans, Arminius and Inguiomerus, Tacitus adds, "et Germanicus, quo magis agnosceretur, detraxerat tegimen capiti." The inference of the juxtaposition is not difficult.

In chapter 22 the modest reticence of Germanicus in setting up the commemoration of his triumph (superbus titulus) is to be divined from the brief clause, "de se nihil addidit," where Ammianus would have added some such characterizing phrase as "modestissimus Caesar." Tacitus proceeds to psychological analysis of the springs of the action, "metu invidiae an ratus conscientiam facti satis esse." In suggesting the two reasons,

he serves a double purpose: he preserves the historic balance of impartial narrative and does not commit himself to either. It is not difficult, however, to decide whether the slur on Tiberius or the tribute to Germanicus is to be accepted as the author's choice.¹⁶

In chapters 24 and 25, the historical narrative serves also to depict the difficulties, in order to give introduction with greater force to "*eo promptior Caesar pergit introrsus*," illustrating the persevering bravery of Germanicus. Meanwhile, in 24, bare as is the recital of the facts, we feel called upon to admire his tender humanity and distress at the loss at sea, "*sola Germanici triremis Chaucorum terram adpulit; quem per omnes illos dies noctesque apud scopulos et prominentes oras, cum se tanti exitii reum clamitaret, vix cohibuere amici quominus eodem mare oppeteret*." In chapter 26, "*addidit munificentiam Caesar, quantum quis damni professus erat, exsolvendo*," almost directly refers to the generosity of the Caesar. A look at his campaigns in summary, and a statement of the prospects of the war, follows in the next sentence, in indirect technique, depending on "*nec dubium habebatur*." The enemy are about to ask for terms (*labare hostes petendaeque pacis consilia sumere*); another year would fill the cup of successes to the brim (*si proxima aetas adiceretur, posse bellum patrari*). The consummate skill of the historian presents Germanicus in this sentence in a position, at the end of his campaign in Germany, of assured success, and at the same time, by adding the second clause (*si proxima, etc.*), renders that position impregnable for the future. It prepares us for and anticipates the recall by Tiberius, which immediately follows. In the full glory of this position too, at the acme of popularity, with a victorious army at his beck, how can we but admire Germanicus, when we see him so magnanimously obeying the Emperor's decree (*haud cunctatus ultra Germani-*

¹⁶ Bruns suggests a possible stylistic reason for the presentation of double motives by Tacitus ("Die Persönlichkeit in d. Geschichtsschreibung d. Alten," p. 79): "das die unfehlbare Sicherheit, mit der die Grundlinien gezogen sind, noch stärker hervortreten lassen soll."

cus, quamquam fingi ea, seque per invidiam parto iam decore abstrahi intellegeret).

The triumph of Germanicus in II. 41 closes the account of his career in Germany. After a brief enumeration of the spoils, follow these sentences:

Augebat intuentium visus eximia ipsius species currusque, quinque liberis onustus. Sed suberat occulta formido, reputantibus haud prosperum in Druso patre eius favorem vulgi, avunculum eiusdem Marcellum flangrantibus plebis studiis intra iuventam ereptum, breves et infaustos populi Romani amores.

A note of open admiration is found in "eximia ipsius species," but in the following words, the reference to the "favorem vulgi" of Drusus, the "breves et infaustos populi Romani amores," speak volumes for the light in which Tacitus wishes us to believe that Germanicus was regarded by the people; dramatically they serve also to shadow forth his tragic fate.

Let us now consider parts of the story of Germanicus which have been designedly omitted in the foregoing pages.

The revolt of the Germanic legions described in *Annals*, I. 31 ff., is an intrinsic part of the history of the period. Its recital follows naturally on that of a similar movement among the forces in Pannonia. No historical treatment of the events consequent on the death of Augustus would be complete without accounts of these mutinies. The introduction, therefore, of careful descriptions of these uprisings in the *Annals*, with their bearing on the disposition and political status of the army, is the duty of the historian. Very simple and harmonious is the transition from the situation at Rome to that of the army in these important provinces (*Ann.*, I. 16, 1: *Hic rerum urbanarum status erat, cum Pannonicas legiones seditio incessit*). All the following passage through chapter 30 is devoted to the mutiny specified in this introductory sentence. The contemporary disturbance among the German legions is taken up in chapter 31, and, with the exception of chapter 33, which introduces Germanicus as an important historical figure

apart from any relation to the mutinous army, and chapters 46 and 47, which throw sidelights on the feeling caused at Rome by the military unrest and the attitude of Tiberius, continues through chapter 49, in whose concluding sentences we read that the final fruit of the wild outburst is as wild a penitence (*truces etiam tum animos cupido involat eundi in hostem, piaculum furoris*). As far as space in the pages of history goes, the two rebellions receive equal attention at the hands of the historian; but a careful examination and comparison of the treatment accorded to each uprising offers results not without weight for those interested in the methods of the Tacitean art.

The outbreak in Pannonia, as Tacitus tells us (chapter 16), was consequent on no definite preliminary acts (*nullis novis causis*). The state of idleness in a summer camp (*intermiserat* (Blaesus) *solita munia*) had already engendered a mischievous spirit (*lascivire miles, discordare*), and the death of Augustus, rousing the memory of political changes in which an army had played important rôles, gave the final impulse to disorder (*mutatus princeps licentiam turbarum et ex civili bello spem praemiorum ostendebat*). The seven following chapters paint a vivid picture of the mutinous camp. There is no leading figure; with kaleidoscopic effect the personages and details pass before us as we read. We recognize the familiar figure of the "walking delegate" in the "*Percennius quidam, dux olim theatralium operarum, dum gregarius miles, proca lingua et miscere coetus histrionali studio doctus*," as he gathers the discontented element of the camp together, at first in midnight meetings, then, growing bolder, more openly fans the flame of mutiny, until after the insurrectionary speech given in chapter 17, it bursts into a blaze. Blaesus, intrepid and resolute throughout, although *legatus* does not claim our attention more closely than Aufidius Rufus, the prefect, with his experiences at the hands of the soldiers, related in chapter 20, unpleasant but not without a touch of comedy, or Bibulenus with his taste for pathos and his inventive powers (chapters 22, 23).

Nor can we forget the centurion Lucilius, characterized in the description of the murderous attack on the centurions by the clause "cui militaribus facetiis vocabulum 'cedo alteram' indiderant," and the appropriate reason for the name. At this juncture Drusus arrives, accompanied by a reassuring bodyguard (Ann., I. 24: cum primoribus civitatis duabusque praetoriis cohortibus), strong in itself, although, to strengthen it further, extraordinary precautions have been taken (et cohortes delecto milite supra solitum firmatae. Additur magna pars praetoriani equitis et robora Germanorum qui tum custodes imperatori erant). To these material defences is added Sejanus, as adviser for Drusus (rector iuveni), to which responsibility is annexed the wide and promising field of appeal to the greed or cowardice of the mutineers (et ceteris periculorum praemiorumque ostentator). Although sent *nullis certis mandatis*, Drusus is merely a representative of Tiberius, and the *ex re consulturum* will fall on Sejanus. The effect of the Emperor's message, read by Drusus to the army, is not soothing; after angry demands for concessions and strong accusations against both Tiberius and Drusus, presented by Tacitus with persuasive innuendo as the spotaneous utterances of the excited soldiery—an admirable instance of the skill with which this historian avails himself of every opportunity for indirect characterization—the contio breaks up, ripe for more violent deeds. The presence of Drusus is no check upon such demonstrations. Lentulus, to whom the soldiers feel especial resentment, is attacked as he is departing from the tribunal in company with the Caesar, and is saved only by the coming up of the strong body of troops which form the imperial reserve (ad cursu multitudinis quae cum Druso advenerat, protectus est). The crisis threatened by the approaching night is averted by a chance that arrays superstition on the side of those in command (chapter 28. 1: noctem minacem et in scelus erupturam fors lenivit: nam luna claro repente caelo visa relanguescere). Interpreting the continuance of this phenomenon as disastrous to their efforts, the soldiers waver, believing the

gods averse to them. We trace the agency of Sejanus in the instant advantage taken by Drusus of this state of mind; the generalization of the methods of the emissaries sent by Drusus to the soldiers on guard in the rebellious camp (*spem offerunt, metum intendunt*) can be interpreted rationally as an out-working of the deliberations of the *periculorum praemiorumque ostentator* of chapter 24. The policy of summary punishment of flagrant offenders may be traced to the same advisory source (chapter 29: *nihil in vulgo modicum; terrere ni paveant, ubi pertimuerint; impune contemni; dum superstitio urgeat, adiciendos ex duce metus sublatis seditionis auctoribus*). Nor is a convenient point of presentation of a fault in the character of Drusus omitted (*promptum ad asperiora ingenium Druso erat*). The strong measures adopted, together with sudden and unseasonable storms, which to the eyes of the ignorant soldiery represent the "caelestis ira," complete the suppression of disorder, and Drusus returns to Rome, leaving matters in a state sufficiently satisfactory. To review briefly the foregoing narrative, it is in summary a lively account of an event with some historical significance, amid whose scenes we discern no central figure, although many personalities of more or less passing interest claim our attention. Drusus, who technically handles the situation, is painted in dull tones; his own speech and actions do not quell the mutiny; that is brought about by the intervention of Providence and the aid of that shrewd advisor, Sejanus. We have already noted that the concluding steps taken by Drusus serve to illustrate a defect of character, and upon this Tacitus comments openly. These points are emphasized here because we shall find in the story of the second mutiny features which present contrasts almost symmetrical, so much so that the first narrative forms an admirable foil to throw out the stronger colors of the second.

The insurrections occur at the same time (chapter 31: *isdem fere diebus*); the causes are similar (*isdem causis*); but the second presents difficulties far greater than the first (*quanto plures, tanto violentius*). The movement is organized and

general, and the intention of the historian to contrast in this respect the rebellion first outlined is shown by a clause of direct comparison, as well as by the more subtly rhetorical *ἀναίρεσις*, already noted as characteristic of the syncritical figure (31. 5: *non unus haec, ut Pannonicas inter legiones Percennius, . . . sed multa seditionis ora vocesque*). The conclusion of chapter 32 also calls attention with a deeply rhetorical color to the securely founded and concerted nature of the insurrectionary movement, where after relating the fact that the soldiers had taken the control of the camp into their own hands, Tacitus adds the psychologist's reflection "id militares animos altius coniectantibus, praecipuum iudicium magni atque implacabilis motus, quod *neque* disiecti *aut* paucorum instinctu *sed* pariter ardescerent, pariter silerent, tanta aequalitate et constantia ut regi crederes." A contrast between the legions affected in each case by rebellion and their military position is suggested in chapter 31. 5; the German legions are masters of the situation, no strong praetorian cohort is there to overawe them, they need not wait the issue in bodies more powerful than themselves (*nec apud trepidas militum aures, alios validiores exercitus respicientium*; here again is the suggestion of *ἀναίρεσις*); these legions are an influential factor in a political no less than in a military sense. The fact that their position is given by Tacitus as part of their own reflection on the situation at the death of Augustus is significant of the historian's belief in the possibilities that might have resulted from their attitude (chapter 31. 5: *sua in manu sitam rem Romanam; suis victoriis augeri rem publicam, in suum cogno-mentum adscisci imperatores*). (Tacitus here puts into the indirect discourse the contents of the *sed* clause, corresponding to the *nec apud trepidas militum aures*, as *sed multa seditionis ora vocesque* completes the *ἀναίρεσις* beginning in *non unus haec*; by so doing, he adds variety and conceals more artfully the *σχῆμα συγκριτικόν*). The soldiers' belief in their own power is conveyed also in the significant indirect discourse in chapter 31. 1 (*legionibus vi sua cuncta tracturis*), and the full force of

these suggestions may be understood from the rest of the same sentence; their hopes were centered in Germanicus (magna spe fore ut Germanicus Caesar imperium alterius pati nequiret daretque se legionibus vi sua cuncta tracturis). The possibilities for civil war have already been suggested, 16. 1 (ex civili bello spem praeiorum ostendebat); also in 17. 1 (novum et mutantem adhuc principem); so that here the only new note is the definite mention of Germanicus for the leading rôle in the drama played so often in Roman history.

To the evident traces of comparison between the two mutinies, another is added in the beginning of chapter 32 in the form of *σύγκρισις*, already familiar (nec legatus obviam ibat). The directly contrasted figure of Blaesus is so obviously suggested as to require no argument to enforce its presence by that of the commander Caecina, whose position is indicated by the suggestion that follows: quippe plurium vaecordia constantiam exemerat.¹⁷ Under these conditions in the camp of the lower army, it is not surprising to read in chapter 32 of the successful carrying out of a violent attack upon the centurions, and the assumption of entire control of the service by the rebels.

Placing the main characteristics of the Pannonian rebellion, yet fresh in mind, beside the conditions so far developed of the mutiny in Gaul, the result of the comparison is, on the one side, the rendering of the first a mere bagatelle, beginning in idle mischief and ending by chance; while, on the other hand, the critical and important nature of the second is to be more clearly understood by a juxtaposition of its inner workings and suggested issues with the aimless and detached story of the first.¹⁸ Aside from the artistic effect of this bit of literary

¹⁷ This sentence is evidently not so much for the purpose of characterizing Caecina, as to add weight to the gravity of the rebellion by throwing out a reference to the effect upon the mind of the lieutenant, whose career as learned from other historical episodes does not justify criticism of his resolution or courage.

¹⁸ That the first movement was one of greater gravity than Tacitus contrives to make it appear is not improbable. The fact, that three legions had come together (tres legiones miscere, ch. 18) indicates much. If one may not accuse Tacitus of suppression in this matter, it is at least fair to note that this fact is related without comment. It is improbable that they could have thus united without marches of considerable extent which would show a deeper and more intense element than the Tacitean account would have us suppose.

artifice, another motive exists for Tacitus. With the Gallic mutiny, Germanicus enters as an historical character, and we may feel assured that all possible means will be employed to make that entrance a striking and memorable one. The darker the background of the mutiny (*magnus et implacabilis motus*) the more conspicuously will it place in relief the character that Tacitus delights to honor. The conditions sketched in chapters 31 and 32 are per se of a most serious and threatening nature; add to these the mental attitude of the troops towards Germanicus personally, and to meet all the problems and possibilities of the hour a paragon is required. Interpreted by the medium of Tacitean art, Germanicus is that paragon.

The entire responsibility of the Gallic provinces rests with Germanicus (chapter 31. 2, 3: *regimen summae rei penes Germanicum*); hence, once introduced upon the scene as the central personage, his own acts and words would portray character, even without the suggestive touches added where occasion is afforded. With the opening words of chapter 34 Tacitus strikes the keynote for his delineation of Germanicus, incorruptible loyalty to Tiberius (*quanto summae spei propior, tanto impensius pro Tiberio niti*); and the position of this reflection shows that it is to be interpreted with special reference to the mutiny in hand, the description of which is resumed immediately (*audito legionum tumultu raptim profectus*). When Germanicus approaches the camp, the offenders come forth to meet him in apparent penitence (*deiectis in terram oculis velut paenitentia*). If with this we compare chapter 24. 4, where the meeting of Drusus with the Pannonian troops is described, we find a similar imputation of assumed feeling (*quamquam maestitiam imitarentur*), but the addition of two words (*contumaciae proprio*) marks a difference in tone, slight but significant for the relative estimates in which Drusus and Germanicus were held by the troops. The appeals, it may also be noted, in chapter 34 (*postquam vallum iniit, dissoni questus audiri coepere et quidam, presa manu eius per speciem osculandi inseruerunt digitos, ut vacua dentibus*

ora contingeret; alii curvata senio membra ostendebant), are of a personal character, while in chapter 25, which describes the scene before the tribunal of Drusus, it is the Caesar only that calls forth even seeming respect for Drusus. Reluctantly as the soldiers fall into order at the command of Germanicus, they listen respectfully while he reveres the memory of Augustus and dwells on the exploits of Tiberius with praises unstinted and free. This disaffection is shown only faintly (*silentio haec vel murmure modico audita sunt*). It is the reproachful questions of Germanicus (*ubi modestia militaris, ubi veteris disciplinae decus, quonam tribunos quo centuriones exegissent*) that cause the outbreak that is to try so severely his wisdom and loyalty, to the effect that he may emerge from it with heightened glory. Even when this storm breaks it is not the clamor described in chapter 26, addressed to Drusus (*cur venisset; neque augendis militum stipendiis neque adlevandis laboribus, denique nulla bene faciendi licentia? at hercule vergera et necem cunctis permitti*) ending with the personal abuse of Drusus and Tiberius noted above; it is rather an attempted justification of their actions by showing wounds and scars, and a recital of their grievances, long terms of service, lack of pay, unreasonable labor, substantially the burden of complaint of chapter 26, but presented in a different spirit; the name applied in chapter 26 is "mandata"; in chapter 35, even in the case of the veterans who seem the most clamorous, it is appeal, not demand (*orabant*); and to realize the full force of this comparison in enhancing the regard felt for Germanicus, fresh in mind are the points of contrast already established, impressive of the more dangerous nature of the second mutiny (chapter 31: *quanto plures, tanto violentius*; chapter 32. 5: *id militaris animos altius coniectantibus praeceptum iudicium magni atque implacabilis motus, quod, etc.*).

The climax of the situation is reached in the recognition of Germanicus as the rightful heir of Augustus although Tacitus veils this moment of emotional intensity with a guarded phrase (*fuere etiam qui legatam a divo Augusto pecuniam reposcerent*),

and in the zeal of the soldiers for his establishment as emperor, and promises of adherence (*faustis in Germanicum ominibus; et si vellet imperium, promptas res ostentavere*). Up to this time there has not been recorded a word of threat or danger to Germanicus; he is the soldiers' hope, their savior, to him they offer their allegiance. The loyalty of Germanicus is beyond all proof; abhorrence of the thought is vivified in action (*tum vero, quasi scelere contaminaretur, praeceps tribunali desiluit*). The disappointed soldiers demand his return with menacing weapons (*minitantes ni regrederetur*); the dramatic tension of this part of the scene culminates in the Caesar's refusal unto death (*ille moriturus potius quam fidem exueret clamitans, ferrum a latere diripuit, elatumque deferebat in pectus, ni proximi prensam dexteram vi adtinuissent*). The rash actions of those who order him to strike, with the definite addition of the *miles nomine Calusidius*, serve as a background against which stands out the horror of the rest at such atrocity (*saevum id malique moris etiam furentibus visum*), and allows the exit of Germanicus during the pause of shrinking consternation. The encomiastic significance of this chapter for the character of Germanicus can hardly be overestimated; and yet, such is the art of the historian, that there is not one word of direct characterization throughout; the words and actions of the army, of the Caesar himself, unfold with studied care the triumph of an incorruptible nature in an hour of strong temptation; while the inference for history is the averting of a civil war through his pure ambition and loyalty.

Although the first chapter in the mutiny is closed, and the refusal of Germanicus is accepted as decisive, the remaining passages that deal with this matter offer many interesting evidences of the purpose and skill of Tacitus. Chapter 36 contains a summary of the difficulties of the situation which stamps it as a grave emergency. The sedition threatens to spread (*parari legatos qui superiorem exercitum ad causam eundem traherent*); plans for plunder and slaughter are on foot (*destinatum excidio Ubiorum oppidum, imbutasque praeda manus in*

direptionem Galliarum erupturas); the enemy is aware of the insurrection and awaits his opportunity (gnarus Romanae seditionis et, si omitteretur ripa, invasurus hostis); it is a matter that jeopardizes the state, a problem almost without solution (periculosa severitas, flagitiosa largitio; seu nihil militi sive omnia concederetur, in ancipiti res publica).

Chapter 40. All except Germanicus are in fear; their apprehensions lead them to reproaches of their leader. Expression of this feeling gives Tacitus an opportunity to put in strong colors the generous leniency of Germanicus through his favorite instrument of indirect discourse (eo in metu arguere Germanicum omnes, quod non ad superiorem exercitum pergeret ubi obsequia et contra rebellis auxilium: satis superque missione et pecunia et mollibus consultis peccatum). Under the guise of reproach, the Caesar's intrepidity is held up before us (si vilis ipsi salus). Appealed to in the name of the safety of his family, Germanicus, the tender husband and father, is influenced so far only as to remove his wife and family from the scene of danger, but remains himself. This the soldiers will not permit. The fact that they are recalled to their duty and obedience by personal feeling for Germanicus is the only possible inference to be drawn from the scene described in chapter 41. The speech of Germanicus (chapter 42, 43) is for the purpose of characterization and that alone.¹⁹ His patriotism and devotion to Tiberius are stronger than all other considerations (chapter 42, 1: non mihi uxor aut filius patre et re publica cariores sunt). His reproaches and appeals to the soldiers throughout the speech are made not in his own name but that of the Emperor. Agrippina is not referred to as the Caesar's wife; she is *Tiberii nurus*; Germanicus himself is *Augusti pronepos, filius imperatoris nostri*. The speech cannot but be considered a miracle of eloquence and tact, a proof of the facundia of the young general, as powerful an influence in the contio as on the field of battle. The effect on the soldiers

¹⁹ The rhetorical character of this speech is noted by Furneaux, and the evident reminiscence of the speech of Scipio Africanus, Liv., 28, 27, is pointed out.

is instantaneous, so apparent that the speaker recognizes it (chapter 43: *vosque quorum alia nunc ora, alia pectora contueor*); they confess their guilt, offer the most flagrant offenders for punishment, and promise return to allegiance.

The wisdom, tact and generosity of Germanicus thus triumph over all obstacles. The close of the disturbance in the army of Caecina is worth noting, as a point of comparison of Germanicus with Drusus may be here inferred. The punishment of the guilty is put by suggestion from Germanicus, first, in the case of the lower army, into the hands of the eagerly penitent soldiers, who in their zeal hold a court-martial whose results resemble a massacre. Tacitus makes this comment, chapter 44: *Nec Caesar arcebat, quando nullo ipsius iussu penes eosdem saevitia facti et invidia erat*. The same course is followed in the camp of Caecina, with more horrifying results; here, too, we find an allusion to the attitude of Germanicus, chapter 49: *mox ingressus castra Germanicus, non medicinam illud plurimis cum lacrimis sed cladem appellans, cremari corpora iubet*. The application of these passages is obvious. The severity of the punishment is such as to lay the commander-in-chief open to an invidious charge of cruelty; by the skill of Tacitus he is completely absolved from any such accusations, and invested with a spirit of tenderness and humanity; while a like situation in the first mutiny called forth from the historian the sentence, "*promptum ad asperiora ingenium Druso erat*."

It is worth while in this connection to recall the position ascribed by Tacitus to Tiberius with reference to the mutinies. An ostentatious but insincere speech to the senate (*magis in speciem verbis adornata quam ut penitus sentire crederetur*) recognizes the success of Germanicus; a more emphatic mark of praise is awarded Drusus (*paucioribus Drusum et finem Illyrici motus laudavit, sed intentior et fida oratione*). Besides this innuendo on the Emperor's sincerity, his grudging praise of Germanicus hints at a bid for popularity in the actions of his adopted son (*quod largiendis pecuniis et missione festinata*

favorem militum quaesivisset), a dark contrast to what in the mind of Tacitus was the truth in the case.

An historical scene, closely resembling the situation in which we have seen Germanicus during the mutiny in Gaul, but possessing a different denouement, is the occasion of Julian's elevation to the position of emperor. There are many points in the technique of Ammianus in this portion of his history that may reasonably be taken as indication of the fact that he has well in mind not only the Tacitean treatment just noted but other phases of the story of Germanicus. It must be conceded that the later historian had the harder task. He must reconcile, to a character which he would represent as model, a course of action which, to say the least, was of doubtful credit. Direct personal comment was impossible; the only convincing method of making the worse appear the better cause was to force facts and words to do service on the side which Ammianus desired to triumph. The traditional maxims of encomiastic style offer justification of optimistic presentation of dubious matter, and as we shall see, Ammianus did not neglect their instructions. The results achieved may be looked upon as successful, and it is in this part of his delineation of Julian that Ammianus has shown the most persuasive and at the same time most unobtrusive form of art. But let us take up the situation in question.

Under pretence of a movement against the Parthians, the jealous Constantius orders the troops who have been under service with Julian to leave Gaul for the East (XX. 4, 2). As Germanicus (Ann., II. 26) acquiesces in his return from Gaul, at the hour of highest triumph (*haud cunctatus est ultra Germanicus*), so Julian bows to the will of Constantius (*con-
ticit hisque adquieverat Iulianus, potioris arbitrio cuncta
concedens*). But, model general as he is, although submitting to the lessening of his own power, for the soldiers he is compelled to remonstrate.

XX. 4, 4: *Illud tamen nec dissimulare potuit nec silere* (dissimulare, for the Caesar knows well the real object of Constantius in

withdrawing the troops, but hides his knowledge since it concerns him alone) *ut illi nullas paterentur molestias, qui relictis laribus transrhenanis sub hoc venerant pacto, ne ducerentur ad partes unquam transalpinas.*

The next sentence in the *Oratio Obliqua* is a strong illustration of Julian's sagacity as well as of his justice:

verendum esse, adfirmans, ne voluntarii barbari militares, saepe sub eius modi legibus adsueti transire ad nostra, hoc cognito, deinceps arcerentur.

His remonstrance is, however, of little avail. Three hundred picked men from the legions are immediately withdrawn by the *legatus* in charge of the matter, the rest to follow later.

An elaboration of the difficulties which now faced Julian is next introduced in the highly artificial and inverted diction which Ammianus uses to the greatest excess when dealing with what he deems most important. We are put by the wording of Ammianus in possession of the Caesar's thoughts, and, from that point of view, survey the situation.

XX. 4, 6: *Et quia sollicitus Caesar, quid de residuis mitti praeceptis agi deberet, perque varias curas animum versans, attente negotium tractari oportere censebat cum hinc barbara feritas inde iussorum urgeret auctoritas maximeque absentia magistri equitum augente dubitatem.*

The defenceless position of the provinces is touched on again (7),

abstrahendos e Galliarum defensione pugnaces numeros barbarisque iam formidatos.

Julian's whole consideration is for the soldiers and the country, not for himself, as interpreted for us by Ammianus. As Germanicus bore alone the burden of the Gallic mutiny, so Julian encounters the difficulties caused by Constantius' order. His prefect is absent, and the refusal of the latter to return leaves Julian without advisers; the responsibility rests upon him alone (*consiliatorum adminiculo destitutus*). He finally

decides to call all the required troops from their winter quarters to prepare for the march ordered by Constantius. The discontent caused by this decision breaks forth in a lampoon, emanating from the Petulantes, which, among other things not given by the historian, contained the following grievance, an outworking, one would note, of the difficulty suggested by Julian in 4:

XX. 4, 10: nos quidem ad orbis terrarum extrema ut noxii pellimur et damnati, caritates vero nostrae Alamannis denuo servirent, quas captivitate prima post internecivas liberavimus pugnās.

This, the first outward sign of dissatisfaction from the troops, proves the correctness of the Caesar's original thought regarding the situation. Ammianus is certainly not quoting the "libellus" in question; the diction is peculiarly his own.

The permission given to the families to accompany the soldiers, although without comment, is an illustration of the just kindness of Julian. The route chosen for the departure lies through Paris, where Julian was then staying. Forestalling any unfavorable interpretation of hidden purpose in this choice, Ammianus is careful to tell us that it was not Julian's own proposition but the suggestion of another.

XX. 4, 11: placuit notario suggerente Decentio per Parisios omnes transire.

Again in 12, where we are told that Julian goes out to meet the troops, and, as becomes the personal commander, addresses and praises individuals *ex more*, suspicion of any ulterior motive is anticipated and checked by giving the substance of his exhortation:

ut ad Augustum alacri gradu pergerent, ubi potestas est ample patens et larga, praemia laborum adepturi dignissima.

Compare for this treatment of the soldiers the passage in Ann., I. 71, where Germanicus encourages his troops:

circumire saucios, *facta singulorum* extollere; vulnera intuens alium spe, alium gloria, cunctos adloquio et cura *sibi*que et proelio firmabat.

So Julian, XX. 4, 12:

idem que adventantibus in suburbanis princeps occurrit, ex more laudans quos agnoscebat, factorumque fortium singulos monens, animabat lenibus verbis.

A farewell banquet is given to the chiefs, and permission is accorded to them to make any necessary request. The artifice employed by Tacitus in Ann., II. 13, where the soldiers' free talk around the camp-fire on the eve of battle is made a medium of imparting the esteem in which they hold Germanicus, has an echo here in Ammianus. The chiefs return from the convivium "dolore duplici suspensi et maesti," and the cause of their grief is assigned, in their own sorrowing reflection, "quod eos fortuna quaedam inclemens et *moderato rectore* et terris genitalibus dispararet." Their feeling leads to action during the night;²⁰ they throng the palace of Julian and hail him as Augustus. There is no avenue left for escape (14: spatiis eius ambitis, ne ad evadendi copiam quisquam perveniret); Julian delays until delay is no longer possible (expectari coacti dum lex promicaret, tandem progredi compulerunt), and is greeted with more determined cries of "Augustus." The description of his refusal, dramatically put as, we remember, was that of Germanicus on a like occasion, sounds like an amplification of the Tacitean theme.²¹

15: et ille, mente fundata universis resistebat, et singulis, indignari semet ostendens, nunc manus tendens oransque et obsecrans, ne post multas felicissimasque victorias agatur aliquid indecorum, neve intempestiva temeritas et prolapsis discordiarum materias excitaret.

The occasion for a speech that would prove his sincerity and loyalty to the Emperor is not overlooked by the historian.

XX. 4, 16: Cesset ira quaeso paulisper: absque dissensione vel rerum adpetitu novarum impetrabitur facile quod postulatis,

²⁰ XX. 4, 14. Nocte vero coeptante in apertum erupere discidium. Cf. Ann., I. 28; noctem minacem et in scelus erupturam.

²¹ Ann., I. 35, quasi scelere contaminaretur, praeceps tribunali desiluit.

quoniam dulcedo *vos* patriae retinet, et insueta peregrinaque metuitis loca, redite iam nunc ad sedes nihil visuri quia displicet, transalpinum. Hocque apud Augustum capacem rationis et prudentissimum ego competenti satisfactione purgabo.

Despite the concessions of this speech, the insistent soldiers continue their demands, and Julian, after vain protests and delay, is compelled to accept the honor, which Ammianus would have us consider thrust upon him. The ardor of the troops, even resorting to threats and reproaches, as we remember did also the troops of Germanicus, the order to assume a crown, the scruples of Julian representing his reluctance, the repetition of the necessity pressing on him, all these are amplification of the historian eager to excuse and defend the course taken by his favorite Emperor. From the standpoint of history, we need no such elaborations of the circumstances; they are purely biographical, serving only to illustrate a point of character, which actual results contradict. The emphasis laid on *necessitudo* is a point worth special consideration:

XX. 4, 14. Tandem progredi compulerunt.

17. Caesar adsentire coactus est.

18. Trusus ad necessitatem extremam iamque periculum praesens vitare non posse advertens si reniti perseverasset.²²

This is to be recognized as a part of *εὐφημία* enjoined in the four general maxims for encomium (Aristid., Sp. II. 505, 10),²³ a form of the *ὅλως ἀεὶ πάντα ἐπὶ τὸ καλλίον ἐργάζεσθαι* to which the rhetorician exhorts the would-be worker in encomiastic literature (Nic. Soph., Sp. III, p. 481, 24). Still more apt to the case in hand is the phrase in Cicero, de Inv. 174—"cum incolumitati videbimur consulere, vere poterimus dicere nos honestatis rationem habere quoniam sine incolumitate eam nullo tempore possumus adipisci."

²² Compare the words of Julian in the speech to the army, XXI. 5, 5. At nunc cum auctoritate vestri indicii *rerum que necessitate* compulsus ad angustum elatus sum culmen, where the same motive is transferred to the indirect technique.

²³ λαμβάνονται δὲ οἱ ἔπαινοι κατὰ τρόπους τέσσαρας αὐξήσει παραλείψει παραβολὴ εὐφημία.

Confirmation of Julian's attitude is conveyed in the paragraphs that follow (19-22), which have no indispensable historical force, but continue the theme of the foregoing passage for elaboration of the new emperor's reluctance and his conscientious action. Julian is stunned by the turn that matters have taken (4. 19-20: *accidentium varietate perterritus*); his modesty and reluctance to assume imperial honors are impressed upon the reader by his course of action (19: *nec diadema gestavit, nec procedere ausus unquam, nec agere seria quae nimis urgebant*). But the soldiers again flock to the palace, and with insisting shouts and threats refuse to depart unless they see their chosen Emperor in his imperial robes (4. 22: *non antea discesserunt quam adsciti in consistorum fulgentem eum augusto habitu conspexissent*). The reiteration of this phase of the matter can have but one motive, namely, the justification of Julian's acceptance. We find the same points made prominent in the letter sent later by Julian to Constantius (XX. 8, 5 ff.); he dwells upon the violence of the soldiers and his own unwillingness. He was shocked, and sought concealment (XX. 8, 9: *cohorruui, fateor, et secessi amendatusque dum potui salutem mussatione quaerebam et latebris*); he appeared to the soldiers in the final extremity only for the purpose of stilling their tumult (XX. 8, 9: *cumque nullae darentur induitiae, libero pectoris muro, ut ita dixerim, saeptus progressus ante conspectum omnium steti, molliri posse tumultum auctoritate ratus, vel sermonibus blandis*); the excitement of the troops, their menaces and threats are emphasized (8, 10: *exarsere mirum in modum, eo usque proveci, ut quoniam precibus vincere pertinacione conabar, instanter mortem contiguus adsultibus intentarent*). Thus does he plead the final exigency which forced him to the course adopted (10: *victus denique mecumque ipse contestans quod alter confosso me forsitan libens declarabitur princeps, adsensus sum, vim lenire sperans armatam*).

In the last sentence, which contains his own self-justification (*mecumque ipse contestans, etc.*), is the very essence of the

Ciceronian dictum for the interpretation of *necessitas* as *honestas*; if safe, he might consider an honorable future, faithful to Constantius, in which case he really consulted that which was honorable. There is proof from other writings of Julian that the substance of his communication to Constantius was what Ammianus here conveys, but the application of this letter to the historian's purpose of eulogizing Julian is what is noteworthy; and it speaks eloquently for the lessons learned from Tacitus by the later writer in the instruments of the indirect method, though the art of concealing their use was not so well mastered. We feel the special pleading in Ammianus before we have received its complete import; in Tacitus, all details are in our minds ere the writer's purpose has been suspected, so speciously is the historical continuity maintained.

The speech made by Julian before the assembled soldiers (XX. 5, 3-8) reveals in the summarizing of Julian's exploits a further attempt at justification. The setting-forth of the past, thus blending with praise for the army the claims of Julian to distinction, is an artistic touch. The preliminary reference to his youth at the time when he became Caesar (*vix dum adulescens specie tenus purpuratus*) casts a more strongly favorable light upon the glory since achieved. Since that time, he has never wavered in a virtuous and moderate course (*numquam a proposito recte vivendi deiectus sum*); he has been foremost in every undertaking (*vobiscum in omni labore perspicuus*); then follows, with the *αὐξήσις* permitted to the general's speech, the description of difficulties and dangers past (*cum dispersa gentium confidentia post civitatum excidia peremptaque innumera hominum milia, pauca, quae semiintegra sunt relictas, cladis immensitas persultaret*). It is needless to recount all the struggles of inclement seasons; when both on land and sea *others* refrained from warlike efforts they vanquished the Alamanni. Here is the implied *σύγκρισις* with former armies and rulers, nations previously unconquered having succumbed (*indomitos antea*). That most glorious day at Strasbourg, liberating Gaul forever, must

not be ignored (*ille beatissimus dies vehens quodammodo Galliis perpetuam libertatem*). Although from Julian's own lips, the almost arrogant terms of praise relating to himself are softened and deprived of invidious effect by extending the praise to the soldiers, and the personal relations between generals and troops.

It is clear that all the palliating circumstances of the situation have been brought out vividly by Ammianus in the passages just reviewed, and that the object of this handling of the subject with its consistent use of the instruments of indirect technique, results from the resolve of the historian to shed the most favorable light upon this passage in the life of his favorite Emperor. Incidentally, we get a few facts, from which inferences of contrasting signification could be drawn. Compare for instance the quaintly frank acknowledgment of the situation found in XX. 8, 4, where Julian's intention to send a letter to Constantius is discussed.

Et quamquam non repugnantur, tamen nec abrogantibus verbis quicquam scripsit ne videretur subito renuntiassse.

Another point which might be utilized to refute the view which Ammianus wishes to present of Julian's forced acceptance of the power is the story of the omen (XX. 5, 10). The genius publicus appears to Julian on the night preceding his elevation to the purple, and warns him against resistance to fate.

Olim, Iuliane, vestibulum aedium tuarum observo latenter, augere tuam gestiens dignitatem et aliquotiens tanquam repudiatu abscessi; si ne nunc quidem recipior, sententia concordanto multorum, ibo demissus et maestus. Id tamen retineto imo corde quod tecum non habitabo.

There is also, of course, in this a possible suggestion of spiritual reasons for accepting these honors with proper resignation; it casts, as it were, the blessing of heaven upon the new Emperor and reconciles him to the breach of fidelity to Constantine by assuring the protection of the gods.

The points of similarity between the treatment adopted by

Ammianus of this, the turning-point in Julian's case, and that accorded by Tacitus to a like crisis in the life of Germanicus seem therefore too striking to be viewed with indifference by students of literary theory. The Tacitean narrative, with its brilliance and strength, cannot fail to impress even the ordinary reader. It is small wonder then that Ammianus, with strong desire to achieve results in his own work, should seize for his own purpose details of method of which others, devoid of such a purpose, would realize only the impressive results.

The conviction of Tacitus that the death of Germanicus in Asia was due to the machinations of Tiberius, with Piso as his tool, is strongly impressed upon all readers of the *Annals*. The plot is foreshadowed in *Ann.*, II. 5. After a chapter devoted to sketching trouble in the East, the passage cited opens with this sentence:

ceterum Tiberio haud ingratum accedit turbari res Orientis, ut ea specie Germanicum suetis legionibus abstraheret, novisque provinciis impositum *dolo* simul et casibus obiectaret.

Following this in immediate connection we find:

at ille quanto acriora in eum studia militum, et aversa patrum voluntas, celebrandas victorias intentior.

The sentence therefore serves as a comment on the attitude of Tiberius at a period quite remote from the catastrophe described in *Ann.*, II. 69 ff.,²⁴ and as a connecting link for the resumption of the narrative which deals with Germanicus. It is not probable either that Tacitus, with his mastery of persuasive artifice, overlooked the effectiveness of placing in close juxtaposition the malicious outworkings of the "aversa patrum voluntas" and further evidence for the "impensus pro Tiberio niti" noted in I. 34. Tacitus makes no effort here to conceal the fact that it is his own opinion that he records. It is simply and directly stated, and contains a synopsis of the plot, which, as he believes, was afterwards carried out by Tiberius so

²⁴ The death of Germanicus.

successfully. If no other proofs of the conviction of Tacitus were added, by the one word "dolo" he brands Tiberius with guilty complicity in the death of Germanicus, a complicity more base because long-studied and deliberate. But further proofs are not lacking, both openly and covertly presented: and not the weakest indication of his belief is the growth of a like feeling in the mind of one, who, abandoning himself to the spell of the author, reads without reflection. A closer reasoner might suggest awkward questions, and point to inconsistencies in the characteristics of Tiberius, hard to reconcile.

In due accordance with the design sketched in II. 5, Germanicus is recalled from Germany, and further developments are related in II. 43, where Tacitus avails himself of the *Oratio Obliqua* to represent in the Emperor's own words the first steps taken.

Ann. II. 43, 1. *Igitur haec et de Armenia quae supra memoravi apud patris disseruit, nec posse motum Orientem nisi Germanici sapientia componi nam suam aetatem vergere, Drusi nondum satis adolevisse.*

If we place beside this passage a sentence from II. 26, where Tiberius is quoted as commenting invidiously on the strategic powers of Germanicus by contrasting with the methods used by the Caesar in Gaul Tiberius' own former achievements, we can best appreciate the insinuation conveyed in the words cited above.

Ann. II. 26. *se noviens a divo Augusto in Germaniam missum, plura consiliis quam vi perfecisse.*

The use of *sapientia* in II. 43, after the reflection in the earlier passage is a sarcastic comment on the phrase, "Drusi nondum satis adolevisse," for, as we remember, Germanicus was but two years the senior of Drusus. Under the guise of praise and reward, Germanicus is despatched to his death. With a *sed*, whose suggestive adversative force cannot be overestimated to meet the requirements of the historian's implication, the Emperor's next move is introduced, the substitution of Cn.

Piso for Creticus Silanus as legate of Syria. The phrsaes that characterize or comment on the individualities of these men, apparently the ordinary asides that history permits on the admission of a new personage of even slight importance, are in this connection charged with sinister significance for the motives that prompted the change.

Sed Tiberius demoverat Suria Creticum Silanum, per adfinitatem conexum Germanico, quia Silani filia Neroni vetustissimo liberorum eius pacta erat, praefeceratque Cn. Pisonem, ingenio violentum et obsequi ignarum, insita ferocia. . . .

Confirmation of these dark suspicions is supplied by Piso's own judgment, "nec dubium se habebat delectum, qui Suriae imponeretur ad spes Germanici coercendas;" still another link in the chain of evidence against Tiberius is the hint of opinion prevalent at the time,

Ann., II. 43. Credidere quidam data et a Tiberio occulta mandata,

and the implication of Livia in the cruel secret,

et Plancinam haud dubio Augusta monuit aemulatione muliebri Agrippinam insectando.

The clause introduced by *nam* which follows makes plausible the facts just stated by relating the private feeling in the Emperor's household. The "mandata" mentioned above are plainly hinted at again in chapter 55:

At Cn. Piso, quo properantius *destinata* inciperet.

Again in III. 16, the existence of such instructions is supported by a discreetly impersonal statement under the guise of perfect impartiality and the strictest regard for historical accuracy.

Audire me memini ex senioribus visum saepius inter manus Pisonis libellum, quem ipse non vulgaverit; sed amicos eius dictitavisse, litteras Tiberi et mandata in Germanicum contineri, et destinatum promere apud patres principemque arguere ni elusus a Seiano per vana promissa fore; nec illum sponte extinctum, verum

immisso percussore. Quorum neutrum adseveraverim; neque tamen occulere debui narratum ab iis, qui nostram ad inventutem duraverunt.

In the words of the dying Germanicus, another allusion to the same subject is found in II. 71, 7: "fingentibusque scelesta mandata aut non credent hominus aut non ignoscent." Here "fingentibus" and the epithet "scelesta" are in keeping with the loyal belief of Germanicus; and yet the last words, "aut non excusent" leave room even in his mind for doubt. A speech reported to be from the lips of Domitius Celer offers assurance to Piso in the following words.

II. 77, 6. est tibi Augustae conscientia, est Caesaris favor, sed in *oculto*; et perisse Germanicum nulli iactantius maerent quam qui maxime laetantur.

This speech, from its rhetorical color and diction, may safely be considered as a Tacitean invention. Public sentiment also at the funeral rites of Germanicus recognizes this suspicion, II. 73. "*suorum* insidiis externas inter gentes occidisse."

From the passages quoted it will be seen that in the presentation of this one bit of evidence against Tiberius and Livia, Tacitus exhausted every source of indirect information: the belief in actual instructions to Piso current at the time of his appointment over Syria (chapter 43); the knowing talk of old men, survivors of that time, heard by Tacitus himself (III. 16); the allusions more or less definite of Piso's friends (III. 16; II. 77, 6); opinion general at Antioch when the death of Germanicus was the one absorbing topic (II. 73, 3); the significant words wrung from the lips of the dying hero, despite his fidelity to his adoptive father (II. 11). Nowhere perhaps does Tacitus give a more masterly proof of the art that conceals art than in his treatment of this one detail of the Germanicus narrative. Only once (chapter 55) do we find a trace of the author's personal view; and yet testimony for the existence of such damning evidence against Tiberius is found in most insidious form on every page.

The intricate and exhaustive presentation of this point is another instance of the keenly logical insight of Tacitus. Documents that contained instructions which might be construed as boding ill to Germanicus were the only possible proofs of the complicity of the Emperor in the crime of Piso, if crime there were. The death of Piso, by his own hand, related as a simple historical fact (III. 15), or, as suggested in immediate sequence (III. 16), by an emissary from the palace, a report originating among his intimates, who, if any one, would know the truth, and his silence before that time, removed all possibility of adducing verbal testimony. In matters of such public note as a trial in the senate, the insinuations of even a Tacitus could find no place. Matter capable of being construed for his purpose lacking, the historian must content himself with developing his proofs from a source not so well known or whose very nature allows surmise of its suppression. The only phrase in Piso's farewell letter to Tiberius which could apply to the point under consideration is designedly ambiguous (III. 16)—“*deos immortales testor, vixisse me, Caesar, cum fide adversum te neque alia in matrem tuam pietate,*” words which might be interpreted as a general phrase, or charged with strong significance to one in the secret. The presumptions offered by Tacitus in favor of the existence of such “*mandata*” far outweigh the negative argument to the contrary, lying in the fact that no such papers ever came to light. Whatever be its legal status, inference in such cases is stronger than actuality for producing opinion, Tacitus could not reverse the verdict of existing records, such as a decree of the senate; but by instilling belief in the possibility of evidence suppressed or destroyed he could influence the decision of the ages yet to come against the Emperor whom he hated. Given proof of collusion between Tiberius and Piso, and Piso involved in the death of Germanicus, the case against Tiberius is complete.

The process of inducing the belief that Germanicus met his death through poison, administered at the instigation of Piso, is pursued in the same insidious manner. Germanicus himself

believed implicitly in the guilt of Piso; we have specific statements to that effect, first in the form of a generally accepted historical fact, which the historian records as a matter of course (II. 69, *saevam vim morbi augebat persuasio veneni a Pisone accepti*); again in the indirect discourse, carrying with it the stronger appeal to credence that personality imparts. The messengers sent by Piso are looked upon as spies who would pry into the sick man's state with a view to evil symptom (II. 69, *ut valetudinis adversa rimantes*) and elicits from Germanicus expressions of indignation (II. 70, . . . *lenta videri veneficia; festinare et urgere ut legiones solus habeat. Sed non usque eo defectum Germanicum neque praemia caedis apud interfectorem mansura*); his death is a murder (*caedis*) and Piso is the murderer (*interfector*). Again in the speech made by Germanicus when the end approached, Piso is branded as his destroyer (II. 71, . . . ; *nunc scelere Pisonis et Plancinae interceptus; referatis patri ac fratri, quibus acerbitatibus dilaceratus, quibus insidiis circumventus miserrimam vitam pessima morte finierim*). That the belief that he was poisoned was shared in by the friends of Germanicus is shown by the language used in describing the cremation of the body at Antioch; although actual results left the question open (II. 73, . . . *praetulent ne veneficii signa, parum constitit, nam ut quis misericordia in Germanicum et praesumpta suspicione aut favore in Pisonem pronior, diversi, interpretabantur*). The demand made by Vitellius and Veranius for Martina, famed for her skill in poisons, assert the belief of these friends of the deceased Germanicus in the theory that he was poisoned (II. 74,²⁵ . . .). This woman Martina, to whose name is attached a phrase, apparently careless, but in reality full of meaning (*Plancinae percaram*) afterwards died under circumstances

²⁵ *Infamem veneficiis ea in provincia et Plancinae percaram, nomine Martinam in urbem misit, postulantibus Vitellio ac Veranio ceterisque. Cf. the accusations made by the same friends of Germanicus, III. 13, where the substance of the speech made by Vitellius (multa eloquentia Vitelli) is produced in Oratio Obliqua, sacra hinc et immolationibus nefandas ipsius (Piso) atque Plancinae, . . . Postremo ipsum (Germanicus) devotionibus et veneno peremisse.*

which throw a strong light upon the impartial statements of Tacitus as to the presence of poison in the body of Germanicus (III. 7, . . . *Vulgatam erat missam, ut dixi, a Cn. Sentio famosam veneficiis subita morte Brundisii extinctam, venenumque nodo crimium eius occultatum, nec illa in corpore signa sumpti exitii reperta*). If the poison left no traces in this case (and suicide by poison is the inference) what need was there to prove its presence in the body of Germanicus? A carefully laid train of circumstantial evidence brings the responsibility home to Piso in another way. Martina, his instrument, was removed (*subita morte*) before he returned to Rome (III. 7, . . . *subdola mora scelerum probationes subverteret*); recourse to magical arts, closely connected with the name of the *veneficariae* is reported in suggestive relation to the acts of Piso.

II. 69. *Et reperiabantur solo ac parietibus erutae humanorum corporum reliquiae, carmina et devotiones et nomen Germanici plumbeis tabulis insculptum, semusti cineres ac tabo obliti aliaque malifica, quis creditur animas manibus infernis sacrari.*²⁶

The death-bed speech of Germanicus (II. 71), from which extracts have already been given, is a purely rhetorical bit of writing; but the passages cited above are evidence of the historian's power of adapting such material to the ends of indirect delineation. The parting injunctions to Agrippina convey hidden but unmistakable reference to Tiberius (II. 72, . . . *neu regressa in urbem aemulatione potentiae validiores inritaret*) even without the sentence that follows, "*haec palam, alia secreto, per quae ostendere credebatur metum ex Tiberio*;" even in the fair mind of Germanicus, according to the conjectures of his friends, based upon his dying words and actions, lay the dark foreboding of evil intent from Tiberius toward himself and his. Other points in this speech are better noted in connection with the narrative of Julian's story in Ammianus.

²⁶ Cf. III. 13, *devotionibus et veneno peremisse; sacra hinc et immolationes nefandas.*

The part of the Germanicus story which deals with the funeral rites and attendant circumstances is indisputably reproduced from a *laudatio funebris*; a form of literature that by this time had come to conform closely to the rules of rhetoric, so much so that in it the formal theory of the encomium was followed as a matter of course. A comparison of the *Laudationes* of Germanicus, as found in Dio Cassius (LVII. 18), Suetonius (Cal., 3 ff.), and Tacitus (Ann., II. 72), make a common source obvious; the biographer has reproduced it in greater detail, as befits his literary theory; the historians have dealt with it more succinctly, each in his characteristic method.

The Tacitean treatment, although as highly encomiastic in its effect as that of either Dio or Suetonius, conforms punctiliously to the requirements of the code that governs historiography. As far as the *τόποι* of the encomium are concerned, Tacitus carefully chooses only such as would throw light on contemporary or succeeding historical events, the family life of Germanicus, his character, achievements, fate. He dwells most forcibly on the second, for it was by this, if at all, that Germanicus must have influenced the course of history. Of details of his physical appearance, possessions, favorite pursuits, our author gives us nothing, for these lie wholly within the realm of biography, and are extraneous to history. But it is not the careful culling out of biographical material that distinguishes the Tacitean form of this *laudatio*; Dio Cassius has adopted an equally critical view of that point. The reconciliation of the introduction of any purely encomiastic passages into a work avowedly historical, both in form and aim, is the delicate problem of literary discrimination, ignored by Dio Cassius, but solved by the Latin historian with admirable success. Public feeling is an essential part of history; the attitude of the court, the mob, the world at large as known at the epoch whose events are recorded, the judgment or surmises of friends or enemies of contemporaries or the immediately succeeding generation—the faithful setting down of all of these

falls to the historian, and it is by means of this recognized function of historiography, that Tacitus contrives to insert material for panegyric without apparent violation of his own literary theory, and without breaking the continuity of the historical narrative. By throwing his encomium of Germanicus into the indirect discourse, he differentiates its use from a biographical characteristic to a legitimate instrument of historiography. That all the necessary *τόποι* are preserved will be seen by introduction of the text. No *προομιον* is needed in an historical narrative, and the *γένος* has already been given (I. 33); *ἀνατροφή* would not come within the scope of history, belonging to a period previous to that of his appearance as a public personage. We should expect, as stated above, an emphasizing of character through the *πράξεις*, and such is the case.

The first motif for the introduction of a laudatory theme is found in the widespread sorrow at the death of Germanicus (II. 72).

Neque multo post exstinguitur, ingenti luctu provinciae et circumiacentium populorum; indoluere externae nationes regesque.

This magnifies his memory by showing the esteem in which he was held abroad, and an elaboration of the reasons follows almost as a matter of course in point of fact, it might have been almost as a matter of course. In point of fact, it might have been written in the *oratio obliqua*, so naturally does it seem to express the thoughts of those mentioned in the context.

II. 72. tanta illi comitas in socios, mansuetudo in hostis; visuque et auditu iuxta venerabilis, cum magnitudinem et gravitatem summae fortunae retineret, invidiam et adrogantiam effugerat.

The qualities dwelt upon in this extract come obviously under the head of *πράξεις εἰς ἀρετὰς διηρημέναις*. Cic. de Or., II. 84, 343, enumerates *comitas* and *mansuetudo* (*clementia*) among other qualities calling for praise:

Sunt enim aliae virtutes quae videntur in moribus hominum, et quadam *comitate* ac *beneficentia* positae . . . Nam *clementia*,

iustitia, benignitas fides, fortitudo in periculis communibus incunda est auditu in laudationibus.

A further comment from Cicero is illuminating for the encomiastic significance of "cum magnitudinem et gravitatem summae fortunae retineret invidiam et adrogantiam affugerat."

De Or., II. 84, 342. quod ipsa virtus in earum rerum (*i. e.*, bona quae fortuna dat) usu ac moderatione maxime cernitur, tractanda in laudationibus etiam haec sunt naturae et fortunae bona, in quibus est *summa laus*; *non extulisse se in potestate*, non fuisse insolentem in pecunia, *non se praetulisse aliis propter abundantiam fortunae, ut opes et copiae non superbiae videantur ac libidini, sed bonitati ac moderationem facultatem et materiam dedisse.*²⁷

This apparently simple statement of facts referring to the deep grief felt for the fate of Germanicus lies quite within the scope of an historical work, and reflecting as it does a general sentiment, is not colored by the personality of the author. The introduction of further and more rhetorically laudatory matter, such as follows in chapter 73, must necessarily, aside from artistic incongruities, lay the historian open to the charge of partiality. It is to avoid both possibilities, that Tacitus has cast this matter, as before noted, in the *oratio obliqua*; its laudatory character is frankly acknowledged, since the form of presentation, devoid of personal suggestion however encomiastic be the tone or feeling, bars all possible criticism of the author's position.

II. 73. Funus sine imaginibus et pompa per *laudes ac memoriam virtutum* eius celebre fuit.

Then follows the passage whose topics reflect most clearly the laudatio, which was its source.

Et erant, qui formam, aetatem, genus mortis ob propinquitatem etiam locorum, in quibus interiit, magni Alexandri fati adaequarent, nam utrumque corpore decoro, haud multum triginta annos egressum, suorum insidiis externas inter gentes occidis; sed *hunc* mitem erga amicos, modicum voluptatum, uno matrimonia, certis

²⁷ Cf. Amm., XXI. 16, 14; Isoc. Panath, 31 ff., especially 32.

libertis egisse, neque minus proeliatorem; etiam si temeritas afuerit, praepeditusque sit percussas tot victoriis Germanias servitio premere. Quod si solus arbiter rerum, si iure et nomine regio fuisset, tanto promptius adsecuturum gloriam militiae, quantum clementia, temperantia ceteris bonis artibus praestitisset.

The correspondence of the points in this passage to the *τόποι* of the *βασιλικὸς λόγος* is too obvious to require specific detail; we would call attention to the *σύγκρισις* with Alexander, a character constantly referred to as a model monarch by the writers of encomia. Extant panegyrics show that this king was an example that had done good service also in Roman laudatory literature. The circumstances of the death of Germanicus, as instanced in the text, make the comparison a natural one, and the emphasis of similarity of condition is used with great artistic effect to throw out the contrast of character. Germanicus was gentle, temperate, chaste—characteristics to which the well-known faults of Alexander lend a suitable relief. He was yet no less a warrior, but without the rash and inconsiderate spirit of a tyrant. The invidious term, “temeritas,” embodying the Roman criticism of an Alexander, deflects still more the balance of comparison in favor of Germanicus. The last sentence (quod si solus . . .) seems to have some correspondence to the *ἐπίλογος* of the encomium, in that it presents in summary fashion the strongest qualities of the subject, into which an appreciation of possibilities neutralized by conditions enters. This element, with its prophetic perspective, possibly supplies the place of the apostrophe to a dead hero which was the general conclusion of the epilogue, and thus completes the list of encomiastic topics as formulated by the rhetoricians for this branch of epideictic literature.

The utilization of a people's grief as an instrument of praise for the dead is found again in the beginning of Book III, where the scene is Rome. There is much amplification of detail; the merits of Germanicus must be extolled by the expression of

sorrow and regard felt by a whole people. There was no affectation of regret (III. 2, . . . quippe aberat adulatio), and the clause of explanation that follows imputes to the Roman public the author's own power of searching hearts and judging motives (*gnaris omnibus laetam Tiberio Germanici mortem male dissimulari*). Thus amidst the description of the mourning of the city Tacitus skilfully inserts an artifice to increase the odium already directed against Tiberius. Further contributions to the same effect are found in chapter 3, containing the account of the course pursued by the Emperor and his mother (*Tiberius atque Augusta publico abstinuere*), for which with apparent impartiality two supposititious causes are offered, one fair, the other adverse (*inferius maiestate sua rati, si palam lamentantur, an ne omnium oculis vultum eorum scrutantibus falsi intellegentur*); to the same purpose is the suggestion of coercion brought to bear upon the aged Antonia, whose absence from the scene of mourning was also matter of note (*crediderim Tiberio et Augusta, qui domo non excedebant, cohibitam ut par maioris et matris exemplo avia quoque et patrius attineri viderentur*). Of analogous tendency too is the censure of Tiberius implied in the contrast noted by men between the honors paid to Drusus by Augustus and the last rites of Germanicus.

III. 5. *Fuere qui publici funeris pompa requirerent compararentque quae in Drusum patrem Germanici honora et magnifica Augustus fecisset.*

Their language is reported in vivid rhetoric, with considerable dwelling on detail; probable excuses for the discrepancy are anticipated and deprecated.

Tiberius's suppression of further lament and comment, while serving the purely historical purpose of showing his attitude, is employed by Tacitus with consummate skill to add testimony to the esteem in which Germanicus was held by the Romans.

III. 6, . . . multos inlustrium *Romanorum ob rem publicam obisse*,²⁹ neminem tam flagranti desiderio celebratum.

Thus does the one whom Tacitus would have us look upon as the worst foe of the dead hero pay homage to his memory.

The death of Julian described in Book XXV of Ammianus's Histories, although differing widely in circumstances from that of Germanicus, has received at the hands of Ammianus a treatment recalling in some of its features the Tacitean record which has just been under consideration.

An oracle presages the death of Germanicus (II. 54) at Colophon.

Et ferebatur per ambages, ut mos oraculis, maturum exitium cecinisse.

The genius publicus, seen by Julian at his elevation to the throne, appears to him again during the night previous to his last battle.

Am. XXV. 2, 3. ipse autem ad sollicitatam suspensamque quietem paulisper protractus cum somno, ut solebat, depulso, ad aemulationem Caesaris Iulii quaedam sub pellibus scribens obscuro noctis altitudine, sensus cuiusdam philosophi teneretur, vidit squalidius ut confessus est proximis, speciem illam Genii publici, quam, cum ad Augustum surgeret culmen, conspexit in Galliis, velata cum capite Cornucopia per aulaea tristius discedentem.

Scorning alarm, Julian offers supplication to the gods, and then beholds a celestial portent,

XXV. 2, 4. flagrantissimam facem cadenti similem visam, aeris parte sulcata, evanuisse existimavit.

This is interpreted by Etruscan haruspices as boding ill fortune in the coming battle. The Emperor disregards the omen, and at daybreak marches against the enemy. He is fatally wounded in the first onset, is carried to his tent and there dies.

We have considered the deathbed speech of Germanicus;

²⁹ An implied *σύγκρισις* of sweeping force.

a like feature is found in Ammianus, and the phrases of the setting in the two passages form appropriate parallels.

Ann., II. 71, 1. *Adsistentes amicos in hunc modum adloquitur.*

Am., XXV. 3, 15. Julianus, in tabernaculo iacens circumstante adlocutus est demissos et tristes.

Each in his dying speech refers to his premature death, Germanicus with sorrow and indignation, Julian as becomes the philosopher (*haec placide dicta* 21).

Ann., II. 71. *iustus mihi dolor etiam adversus deos esset quod me parentibus, liberis patriae infra inventam praemature exitu raperent.*

A reference to military renown is included in "quondam florentem et tot bellorum superstitem."

The corresponding passage in Ammianus would suggest to the attentive and reflective reader almost a comparison with the fate of Germanicus.

Amm., XXV. 3, 19. *Ideoque sempiternum veneror numen quod non clandestinis insidiis nec longa morborum asperitate sed in medio cursu florentium gloriarum hunc merui clarum e mundo digressum.*

With these points resemblance between the speeches ceases; basing conclusions on the similarities noted, it is not unreasonable to say that Ammianus had the Tacitean passage in mind; the diametrically opposed circumstances precluded further coincidence in outward treatment. Each speech has duality of intention suited to the exigencies of the setting, and each is equally a product of rhetoric.³¹ In the interpretation of a common truism men's dying utterances reveal the truth and command belief; therefore to the obsession of their last words the human mind is most open. Both historians have taken advantage of this maxim of humanity, and, in each case, that which seems a clear glass, through which shines the feelings and personality of the speaker is, in reality, but a mirror, reflecting

³¹ Whatever be the conclusions of editorial authority on the authenticity of such speeches in Ammianus, this one certainly reads as if made to order.

the author's own conception of the truth. The Tacitean speech does not characterize; after so much characterization in the past, addition here would be needless; its twofold object was to stir sympathy for Germanicus and suspicion against Tiberius. Ammianus, without prejudice against superfluity, wished in the speech which he gives to glorify Julian both as Emperor and philosopher; or it might be said, he here interprets, in Julian's own words, the character which it has been his aim to reveal by actions and glorify by comment in the preceding narrative. The whole tone of the speech, as well as specific passages, serve to impress the calm high philosophy of the dying Emperor.

The introduction of passages from the speech itself will best show this.

Amm., XXV. 3, 15. *Advenit, a socii, nunc abeundi tempus e vita impendio tempestivum, quam reposcenti naturae, ut debitor bonae fidei redditurus exulto, non, ut quidam opinantur, adflactus et maerens, philosophorum sententia generali perdoctus, quantum corpore sit beator animus, et contemplans, quotiens condicio melior a deteriore secernitur, laetandum esse potius quam dolendum, illud quoque advertens quod etiam dii caelestes quibusdam piissimis, mortem tanquam summum praemium persolverunt.*

The modest tone of the next sentence is a very artistic touch.

XXV. 3, 16. *Munus autem id mihi delatum optime scio, ne difficultatibus succumberem, arduis, neve me proviciam unquam aut prosternam expertus quod dolores omens ut insultant ignavis, ita persistentibus cadunt.*

Thus does Ammianus make effort to offset and prevent the possibly prejudicial effect of the arrogantly virtuous summary of Julian's life that follows.

Nec me gestorum paenitet, aut gravis flagitu recordatio stringit, vel cum in umbra et angulis amendarer, vel post principatum susceptum, quem tanquam a cognatione caelitus defluentem immaculatum, ut existimo, conservavi, et civilia moderatius regens, exanimatis rationibus bella inferens, et repellens, tametsi pro-

speritas simul utilitasque consultorum non ubique concordent, quoniam coeptorum eventus superae sibi vindicant potestates, reputans autem iusti esse finem imperi obcedientium commodum et salutem, ad tranquilliora semper, ut nostis, propensior fui, licentiam omnem actibus meis exterminans, rerum corrupticem et morum, gaudensque abeo gestiensque ubicumque me velut imperiosa parens, consideratis periculis, obiecit res publica, steti fundatus, turbines calcare fortuitorum adsuefactus.

Another characteristically philosophic passage is found near the close.

(19) Aequo enim iudicio iuxta timidus est et ignavus qui, cum non oportet, mori desiderat et qui refugiat cum sit opportunum.

The concluding passage breathes forth the highest feelings of moderation and patriotism.

(20) Super imperatore vero creando caute reticeo ne per imprudentiam dignum praeteream, aut nominatum quem habilem reor, anteposito forsitan alio, in discrimen ultimum trudam, ut alumnus autem rei publicae frugi, opto bonum post me reperiri rectorem.

The intention of the speech as regards the glorification of Julian's philosophy, and incidentally, by the summarization of his life and virtues, his royal career, is obvious enough. Conspicuous is the continuance of the first theme in the remaining divisions of chapter 3 (21-23). The lofty soul of the philosopher regarded death with calm disdain; but Julian, the tender friend, weeps for the fate of another (*acriterque amici casum ingemuit qui elate ante contempserat suum*). He gently chides his weeping friends, and enters into a discussion on the sublimity of the soul with intricate logic, and thus engaged, passes away (*vita facilius est absolutus*). It is evident that, up to this point, the historian is animated by the strongest desire to depict through words and actions the lofty and sustained spirit of the dying Julian, personal comment being so rare as to form a marked contrast to the author's well-known practice.

A noticeable shift in theory follows; for with the words, *vita*

facilius est absolutus, Ammianus glides into an open *laudatio funebris*, so closely adhering to the most rhetorical type, that it might have been delivered over the Emperor's dead body almost without alteration. Such *elogia* are a characteristic feature of the History of Ammianus. He introduces them at the death of each prominent personage; they seem to represent to him the final stamp of the translation of these from private individuals into the universality of history. Incongruous as these *elogia* seem with the annalistic form chosen by him for his work, they do not surprise, for the reader of Ammianus cannot fail to be impressed with the elasticity of the author's theory of historiography, if indeed any such was ever formulated even in his own mind. His own nature, incurably subjective, led him to epideictic methods; wherever he restrained his inclinations in that direction, and adopted less obvious means of portraiture, there seems to have been a strong Tacitean reminiscence working upon him. Here, at least, his admiration for the hero Emperor so far overbalanced that felt for the historian, that all regard for historical theory is flung to the winds, and Ammianus becomes a panegyrist pure and simple. The incongruity of this has been already noted; one feels the transition from the attempt at characterization through the last words and actions of the Emperor to this rhetorical *laudatio* as almost absurd. Its presence is noted like a patch upon a fair garment. Compare with its bald insertion the *laudatio* of Germanicus, so artfully interwoven by Tacitus into his narrative that we receive it as a bit of history. In Ammianus the *laudatio* is a biography in brief, a detached passage of absolutely personal information concerning Julian, and could be removed in entirety without affecting in the slightest degree the record of historical events.

This will best be shown by a presentation of the text.

XXV. 3, 23. *Quibus ideo iam silentibus (i. e., the weeping friends by the bedside) ipse cum Maximo et Prisco philosophis super animorum sublimitate perplexius disputans, hiante latius suffossi lateris vulnere, et spiritum tumore cohibente venarum, epota*

gelida aqua, quam petiit medio noctis horrore, vita facilius est absolutus anno aetatis altero et tricesimo, natur apud Constantinopolim, a pueritia usque parentis obitu destitutus Constanti, quem post fratris Constantini excessum inter Complures alios turba consumpsit imperii successorum, et Basilina matre, iam inde a maioribus nobili.

The encomium passage begins in most obvious fashion with the words "anno aetatis," continuing through the remaining part of 3 and all of 4. Chapter 5 opens as follows:

Nec fuit post hec lamentis aut fletibus locus. Corpore enim curato pro copia rerum et temporis, ut ubi ipse olim statuerat, conderetur, principio lucis secutae, quae erat quintum Kalendas Iulias, hostibus ex omni latere circumfusi, collecti duces exercitus, advocatisque legionum principiis et turmarum, super creando principe consultabant.

It is evident that the placing of chapter 5 immediately after the words "vita facilius est absolutus" renders the historical sequence perfect, and leaves nothing to be desired in the continuity of events.

The intervening passage is a βασιλικὸς λόγος, conforming to the strictest rhetorical rules. No proem is found here, as that has been already given (XVI. 3). The *γενος* therefore is entered upon immediately, a topic universally given by rhetoricians as the second heading under encomium. According to Athonius,³² this division may embrace four topics, ἔθνος, πατρίς, πρόγονοι, πατέρες. Ammianus has in this case touched on all, and dwells especially on the *εὐγένεια* (iam inde a maioribus nobili). The early training (*ἀνατροφή*) of his hero is also omitted, save by indirect reference, since much has been already said on the subject in previous passages. A sweeping laudation of Julian in general (XXV. 4, 1. Vir profecto heroicis connumerandus, ingeniis, claritudine rerum coalita maiestate conspicuus) is followed by a presentation of his deeds from the point of view of ἀρεταί, a classification formalized by Ammianus himself,

³² Sp. III. 371, 27 ff.

XXV. 4, 1. cum enim sint, ut sapientes definiunt, virtutes quattuor praecipuae, temperantia, prudentia, iustitia, fortitudo, eisque accedentes extrinsecus aliae, scientia rei militaris, auctoritas, felicitas atque liberalitas, intento studio coluit omnes ut singulas.³³

These additional items to the Socratic virtues are, it will be remembered, found also in Cicero's praise of Pompey (Pro Imperio 28). "Fortuna" finds an admirable explanation from the Roman point of view in Cic. de Or., II. 85, 347.³⁴

Neque tamen illa non ornant, habiti honores, decreta virtutis praemia res gestae iudiciis hominum comprobatae; in quibus etiam felicitatem ipsam deorum immortalium iudicio tribui laudationis est.

Liberalitas is an outworking of the virtue φιλανθρωπία, added in Greek encomium either as a separate virtue, or a combination of all virtues.

To review briefly the passage under the author's own categories, we have first (5, 6) the facts praised under the head of temperantia, of which he makes castitas a second division (2, 3) while temperantia in general is treated in 4, 5, 6. Julian's moderation and self-denial, treated with rhetorical elaboration and fullness of detail, receive final impress from a poetic σύγκρισις, (6) Et si nocturna lumina inter quas lucubrabat potuissent voces ullae testari, profecto ostenderant inter hunc et quosdam principes multum interesse quem norant voluptatibus ne ad necessitatem quidem indulsisse naturae.³⁵

A still more artificial working in of the same thought is found in the Actio Gratiarum Iuliano of Claudius Mamertinus (Baehrens, XII. Panegyrici Latini, p. 254), where would-be rulers of unholy memory are offered by Providence the power

³³ Ammianus repeats the name of each virtue at the opening of the passage devoted to it, going back to first principles. Cf. the precepts of Menander (Sp. II. 372, 14 ff.): χρή δὲ γινώσκειν καὶ φυλάττειν τὸ παράγγελμα ὅτι ὅταν μέλλῃς ἀπὸ κεφαλᾶλου μεταβαίνειν εἰς κεφάλαιον, δεῖ προιμιάζεσθαι περὶ οὗ μέλλεις ἐγχειρεῖν ἵνα προσεκτικὸν τὸν ἀκρσατὴν ἐργάσῃ καὶ μὴ ἕως λανθάνειν μηδὲ κλέπτεσθαι τῶν κεφαλαίων τὴν ζήτησιν.

³⁴ Menander (Sp. III. 376, 25) formally recognizes τύχη in Greek encomium. μνημονεύσεις δὲ μετὰ τοῦτο τῆς τύχης, λέγων ὅπ συμπαραμαρτεῖν δὲ ἔοικειν ἐφ' ἅπασι κα μράξεσι καὶ λόγοις τῷ βασιλεῖ τῷ μεγάλῳ τύχῃ λαμπρά.

³⁵ Cf. XXIV. 4, 26, 27; XXV. 2, 2 ff.

to reign as Emperor, under conditions such as concur with Julian's life.

At nunc ultro vobis potestas regnandi datur ut ea quae Iulianus conditione regnetis, ut pro omnium otio die noctuque vigiletis, et cum domini vocemini, libertati civium serviatis, saepius proelium quam prandium capessatis, hihil unquam auferatis et ultro omnibus largiamini, nulli gratificemini, in neminem saeviat, toto in orbe terrarum nullius virginis fama violetur, sit lectulus etiam sine concessis et legitimis voluptatibus Vestalium toris purior, aestate Alamannicum pulverem hieme pruina Thraciae intectis verticibus perferatis.

Julian's vigils and care for camp and soldiers are strong material for encomium;³⁶ labors for the sake of others are especially noted for praise in Latin laudatio.

Cic. de Or. 85, 346. Gratissima autem laus eorum factorum habetur, quae suscepta videntur a viris fortibus sine emolumento ac praemio; quae vero etiam cum labore copiam ad laudandum quod et dici ornatissime possunt, et audiri facillime. Ea enim denique virtus est praestantis viri, *quae est fructuosa alliis, ipsi aut laboriosa, aut periculosa, aut certe gratuita.*

Evidences of *prudencia* (71) are so many that it will be necessary to cite a few only; this paragraph is concise and antithetical, contrasting favorably with the usual involved style of Ammianus, and *iustitia* (8, 9) receives treatment of a similar kind.

Fortitudo (10) is shown by deeds in war and endurance of hardships. The use of *ipse* and *suo* (*ipse* trucem hostem ictu confecit audacter congressus ac nostros cedentes obiecto pectore *suo* aliquotiens cohibuit *solus*) recalls the injunction of Menander (Sp. III. p. 374, 24). *ὅτι αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ διαττατόμενος, αὐτὸς ὁ στρατηγῶν, αὐτὸς ὁ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς βολῆς εὐφίσκων κ. τ. λ.*³⁷

³⁶ Occasions where Ammianus emphasizes this quality are frequent. Cf. XXIV. 3, 9; 3, 11; XXIII. 5, 24 (here the praise is voiced by the army, nihil periculosum fore vel arduum clamitabat sub imperatore plus sibi laboris quam gregariis indicente); XVII. 2, 3; 1, 2. To these add Julian's speech to the soldiers, XX. 8, 6.

³⁷ Cf. Quint., III. 7, 16, gratiora esse audientibus quae *solus* aut primus aut certe cum paucis fecisse dicitur.

Scientia rei militaris (11) is declared from the outcome of sieges and battle, skilful marshalling and encamping, in concise summary. The presentation of these four heads, *prudentia*, *iustitia*, *fortitudo*, *scientia rei militaris* is in its very summarizing an instance of encomiastic theory; facts of universal knowledge are thus to be presented; these deeds of Julian are so well known and so manifold (*prudentiae eius indicia vel plurima . . . quibus autem iustitiae inclaruit bonis, multa significant—Fortitudinem crebritas certaminum—Castrensium negotiarum scientiam plura declarant et nota*) that they need no narration, merely comprehensive reference.

Auctoritas (12), a word which seems to have no single equivalent in the Greek encomium, may possibly have attained its position in the laudatio of the general (for it is here that it seems to have its proper place) by transference of one of the requirements laid down for the symboleutic orator, when oratory came to be weighed as one of the factors that made for military success. This is the ἠθικὴ πίστις of Aristotle (*Rhet.*, II. 1) dependent on the φρονησις, ἀρετῇ, εὐνοία of the orator for its force on an audience. A Roman recognition is given in Quintilian, III. 8, 48.

Multum refert etiam quae sit persona suadentis; quia anteacta vita, si illustris fuit, aut clarius genus, aut aetas, aut fortuna affert expectationem. . . . et quibusdam sufficit auctoritas, quosdam ratio ipsa aegre tuetur.

So III. 8, 12. Valet autem in consiliis auctoritas plurimum. We find in Tacitus examples that are identical in meaning with the above.

Germ. XI. auctoritate suadendi magis quam iubendi potestate.

Hist. I 45. Sed Othoni nondum auctoritas inerat ad prohibendum scelus; iubere iam poterat.

Ann. XV. multa auctoritate quae viro militari pro facundia erat. *Auctoritas* then is in this connection personal influence, derived from the known deeds and character of the subject. So Julian is both feared and loved; he is the associate of his

soldiers in the field, but the stern punisher of the laggard; mutineers are quelled by a threat to leave them; especially does the last instance given by Ammianus apply (13):

Denique id pro multis nosse sufficiet; exhortatum eum simplici contione militem Gallicanum primum adsumptum et Rheno, peragratissimis spatiis regionum extentis per tepentem Assyriam ad usque confinia traxisse Medorum.

This is the *auctoritas* of Tacitus, "quae viro militari pro faciundia erat;" the persuasive power of the soldier orator whose wisdom, bravery, good-will have been proved in the past. In this connection also we have the force of summarization (id pro multis nosse sufficiet).

Felicitas (fortune) (14) is treated with strongly encomiastic amplification.

Felicitas ita eminuit ut ipsis quodammoda cervicibus Fortunae aliquam diu bonae gubernatricis evectus victoriosus cursibus difficultates superstaret immensas et postquam ex occidua plaga digressus est, et quoad fuit in terris, quiescere nationes omnes immobiles ac si quodam caduceo leniente mundana.

Two noteworthy points of rhetorical tradition are the emphasis laid on the hero's triumph over obstacles (difficultates immensas), and the great influence of his power (quoad fuit in terris, quiescere nationes omnes immobilis ac si quodam caduceo leniente mundana). For the last, note the precept of Menander (Sp. III. 377, 10 ff.): ἐν τούτοις ἐρεῖς . . . ὅτι οὐ δεδοίκαμεν βαρβάρους οὐ πολεμίους, ὀχυρώτερον τοῖς βασιλέως ὅπλοις τετειχισμεθα ἢ τοῖς τείχεσιν αἱ πόλεις . . . αὐτοὶ μὴ πολεμοῦντες, παρὰ δὲ τῆς βασιλεῶς χειρὸς νικώσης δεχόμεναι.

Mamertinus speaks of Julian's good fortune in like extravagant terms (Bachrens, p. 266, 6):

Cuius unquam *divinior felicitas* fuit? Paulo ante a liberatis Galliae provinciis lassus inimi—corum capitalium apertis armis et occultis insidiis petebatur in pauculis mensibus *divino munere*

Libyae, Europae Asiaeque regnator est. Quae maiora expectabimus dei praemia? Quae uberiora dona Fortunae?

Here too the magnifying of difficulties adds to the effect.

Liberalitas (15) has proofs *plurima et verissima*. Justice in remitting and exacting tribute (μόριον δὲ τῆς φιλανθρωπίας ἡ δικαιοσύνη, Men., Sp. III. 374, 28) is emphasized among the instances selected. Rhetorical precept covers this also (Men., Sp. 375, 21: ἐρεῖς ἔτι περὶ τῶν φόρων οὐς ἐπιστάττει . . . τοῦ κουφῶς καὶ ράδίως δύνασθαι φέρειν τοὺς ὑποκόους). Here is also the implied comparison with former rulers (quos velut iure vendidere praeteritae potestates), Ammianus using in this passage the σύγκρισις μερική, wherever the figure is employed.

We come now to a portion of the elogium which, although seemingly inconsistent with the rules of Greek encomium as laid down by the technicians, can be reconciled to the same literary form when adapted to historical uses. More than once does Ammianus vaunt his own truthfulness and non-partisan attitude. Perhaps the statement made in XXX. 7, 1, in connection with the elogium of Gratianus may be taken as his generalized dictum on the subject.

Replicare nunc est opportunum, ut aliquotiens fecimus et ab ortu primigenio patris huiusce principis ad usque ipsius obitum actus eius discurrere per epilogos breves, nec vitiorum praetermisso discrimine vel bonorum, quae potestatis amplitudo monstravit, nudare solita semper animorum interna.

Such passages as the one with which we are now about to deal, which presents the vicia of Julian (16-22), satisfy the historical conscience embodied by Ammianus in the passage last quoted, and reconcile the elogium with the impartial treatment claimed for history. Frankly as the faults are admitted, wherever modification is possible we find it. Julian is "levioris ingeni," but this he corrected by most excellent training (verum hoc instituto rectissimo temperabat). Unjust decrees are admitted to be his work, but the highly laudatory prelude to the admis-

sion makes these laws insignificant exceptions (*aestimari poterat, ut ipse aiebat, vetus illa Iustitia, quam offensam vitiis hominum Aratus extollit in caelum eo imperante redisse rursus ad terras*).

22 is devoted to describing his personal appearance, the *κατὰ σῶμα* of the Greek rhetorician, the *forma* of the Roman laudatio. The beauty and brilliancy of his eyes are often mentioned in Ammianus. So too Claudius Mamertinus (Baehr., p. 249) "*micantia sedereis ignibus lumina*." *Τάχος* and *ρῥῶμη*, designated divisions of the topic *κατὰ σῶμα*, find representation in the phrase *unde viribus valebat et cursu*.

The remainder of this passage (23-27) deals with a criticism of Julian made openly by his detractors, (23) *Quoniam eum obtrectatores novos bellorum tumultus ad perniciem rei communis simulant concitasse*.

This is clearly one of the *ἀντιθέσεις* to which rhetoricians call attention, which could not be passed over and for which a strong *λύσις* must be offered by the encomiast. Ammianus presents his defence of the censure quoted, in the form of a point blank denial, the incontrovertible truth, as he tells us (*docente veritate perspicue*). Constantius, not Julian, stirred up the wars which have been laid to the charge of the latter. Basing for encomiastic purposes his epilogue on this sweeping negative statement, he skilfully employs the reference to gravely questionable matter. Julian's career is notable not by the agitation of wars, but by the bringing of them to a glorious issue. His swift and brilliant conduct of the war in the Gauls is reviewed with strong amplification (25); the Alps were no longer a barrier of defense to Italy, so violent were the German tribes; tears and terror were the lot of men; bitter remembrance shared their minds with sadder expectation. In this dire condition of affairs, sent as Caesar when but a youth, Julian achieved a glorious triumph, reducing barbaric monarchs to serfs, and this too with superhuman swiftness (*mira dictu celeritate*). Rapidity in victory is in itself a *κοῖνος τόπος* of encomium.

In the same careful rhetoric, Ammianus paints an elaborate picture of the horrors and difficulties of the Persian war (23-24). With armies cut to pieces, Roman soldiers in captivity, cities razed, fortifications destroyed, Roman empire in Persia was threatened to its downfall. Forced by such exigencies, Julian attacked the Persians to add laurels to Roman arms and his own fame as in the past, had it been the will of Heaven. A point of contact with the *laudatio* of Germanicus (II. 73) may be found in this connection. It will be more obvious if the passages are set side by side.

Ann., II. 73. *quod si solus arbiter rerum, si iure et nomine regio fuisset, tanto promptius adsecuturum gloriam militiae quantum clementia, temperantia, ceteris bonis artibus praestitisset.*

Amm., XXV. 26. *Itaque ut orientem pari studio recrearet, adortus est Persas, triumphum inde relaturus et cognomentum, si consiliis eius et factis inlustribus decreta caelestia congruissent.*

We have in each a summarizing reference to past achievements (*quantum clementia temperantia, ceteris bonis artibus praestitisset . . . ; Itaque ut orientem pari studio recrearet*); a prediction of a glorious future (*adsecuturum gloriam militiae; triumphum inde relaturus et cognomentum*) and an hypothetical clause presenting the conditions that prevent fulfillment of the prophecy (*si solus arbiter rerum, si iure et nomine regio fuisset . . . si consiliis eius et factis inlustribus decreta caelestia congruissent*).³⁸

In the light of the resemblances and parallel points of handling in the two episodes just reviewed, it does not seem too much to claim Tacitus as the model of Ammianus. We would not assert a slavish imitation, nor need the statement be pressed so far as to insist on conscious coincidence of treatment although that is probable. But it seems clear that what

³⁸ Cf. Epitaph of Scipio (C. I. L., I. 33):

Mors perfecit tua ut essent omnia brevia
Honos fama virtusque gloria atque ingenium;
Quibus sei in longa licuisset tibi utier vita
Facile facteis superases gloriam maiorum.

Tacitus approved, the later Roman felt himself privileged to adopt; that wittingly or unwittingly he followed for Julian in this passage the lines of delineation which in the hands of Tacitus had so magnified the character of Germanicus. Where the instances of greatest departure from his model occur, as in the handling of the laudatio, it is the insuperable bent of his own spirit in the direction of biography that caused the deflection.

UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA